

**The**  
**Agroforestry Demonstration Program**  
**in the**  
**San Joaquin Valley**  
*Progress Report*

March 1988

Prepared under contract for the  
FEDERAL-STATE  
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY DRAINAGE PROGRAM  
By the  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

---

This progress report presents the status of research activities being conducted for the Agroforestry Demonstration Program by the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service. The report was prepared under provisions of a cooperative agreement for the Federal-State San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, one of the funding entities sponsoring the demonstration project. Publication of the findings and recommendations included in the report should not be construed as representing the concurrence of any Federal or State agency participating in the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program. Also, mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation by the agencies. The purpose of this report is to provide the Drainage Program agencies with information and alternatives for further consideration.

---

The San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program was established in mid-1984 as a cooperative effort of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Geological Survey, California Department of Fish and Game, and California Department of Water Resources. The purposes of the Program are to investigate the problems associated with the drainage of irrigated agricultural lands in the San Joaquin Valley and to formulate, evaluate, and recommend alternatives for the immediate and long-term management of those problems. Consistent with these purposes, Program objectives address the following key areas: (1) Public health, (2) surface- and ground-water resources, (3) agricultural productivity, and (4) fish and wildlife resources.

Inquiries concerning the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program may be directed to:

San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program  
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2143  
Sacramento, California 95825-1898

**The  
Agroforestry Demonstration Program  
in the  
San Joaquin Valley  
*Progress Report***

---

March 1988

Prepared under contract for the  
FEDERAL-STATE  
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY DRAINAGE PROGRAM  
By the  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

---

This progress report presents the status of research activities being conducted for the Agroforestry Demonstration Program by the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service. The report was prepared under provisions of a cooperative agreement for the Federal-State San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, one of the funding entities sponsoring the demonstration project. Publication of the findings and recommendations included in the report should not be construed as representing the concurrence of any Federal or State agency participating in the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program. Also, mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation by the agencies. The purpose of this report is to provide the Drainage Program agencies with information and alternatives for further consideration.

---

The San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program was established in mid-1984 as a cooperative effort of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Geological Survey, California Department of Fish and Game, and California Department of Water Resources. The purposes of the Program are to investigate the problems associated with the drainage of irrigated agricultural lands in the San Joaquin Valley and to formulate, evaluate, and recommend alternatives for the immediate and long-term management of those problems. Consistent with these purposes, Program objectives address the following key areas: (1) Public health, (2) surface- and ground-water resources, (3) agricultural productivity, and (4) fish and wildlife resources.

Inquiries concerning the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program may be directed to:

San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program  
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2143  
Sacramento, California 95825-1898

THE AGROFORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM  
IN THE  
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

Progress Report  
March 1988

Prepared for the  
Federal-State  
San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program  
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2143  
Sacramento, California 95825-1898  
and other contributing agencies

Under  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Cooperative Agreement No. 7-FC-20-04900

By the  
California Department of Food and Agriculture  
Agricultural Resources Branch  
1220 N Street, Room 104  
Sacramento, California 95814



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	i
1.0 Introduction	1- 1
2.0 Present Status of the Agroforestry Demonstration Program	2- 1
3.0 Future Plans for the Agroforestry Demonstration Program	3- 1
4.0 Progress of the Field Trials	4- 1
4.1 Murrieta Farms	4- 3
4.2 Peck Ranch	4-12
4.3 Thomsen Brothers	4-19
4.4 Sal Carollo	4-26
4.5 Verdigaal Brothers	4-41
4.6 Haynes Ranch	4-51
4.7 Way Farms	4-61
4.8 Arthur Williams & Sons	4-67
4.9 Buttonwillow Land & Cattle Co.	4-72
4.10 Allen Ranch	4-77
4.11 Kings Boys Ranch	4-81
4.12 Bloemhof Agricultural Enterprises	4-85
4.13 Other Farm Reports	4-89
5.0 Tree Selection and Propagation Project Roy Woodward, Roy Sachs, Miles Merwin (ITCI) Department of Environmental Horticulture University of California, Davis	5- 1
6.0 Economic and Marketing Study Luanne Lohr Department of Agricultural Economics University of California, Davis	6- 1
7.0 Wildlife Study Andrew R. Dyer, David L. Chesemore Department of Biology California State University, Fresno	7- 1
8.0 Salt/Water Balance Study	8- 1
9.0 Halophyte Biofilter Trial Carol Watson Environmental Research Laboratory University of Arizona, Tuscon	9- 1
10.0 Financial Information	10- 1
11.0 Agroforestry Directory	11- 1
12.0 Glossary	12- 1






## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) and the United States Department of Agriculture - Soil Conservation Service (USDA - SCS) are currently conducting research on the potential use of agroforestry as an option to help San Joaquin Valley farmers manage drainage water and salinity problems. The use of agroforestry for this purpose is based on salinity management practices used in world regions with soil and climatic conditions similar to those in California.

Irrigation of farmland creates the need to leach accumulated salts from the soil in order to allow the continued production of crops. Problems in the San Joaquin Valley involve shallow ground water tables created when saline water accumulates above low-permeable clay layers in the soil. These high water tables must be lowered below crop root zones in order to prevent losses in production. Additional problems involve potentially harmful elements, such as selenium and boron, which may be contained in this saline water.

The Agroforestry Demonstration Program currently underway is testing and evaluating the feasibility of utilizing trees to reduce the amount of agricultural drainage water generated within the San Joaquin Valley. Salt-tolerant trees have the potential to lower the water table and reduce the volume of this drainage water through evapotranspiration and consumptive uses. Agroforestry can therefore lower the costs of drainage water management by reducing the amount of water which must be treated and/or disposed of in evaporation ponds, solar ponds, or deep-injection wells. Figure 1 illustrates the potential of the agroforestry system to reduce both the volume of drainage water and the volume of irrigation water used on farms in the San Joaquin Valley.

FIGURE 1



The trees can contribute to more than just the reduction of water volume. They can also help increase the production of conventional crops by lowering high water tables. Additionally, the trees, in combination with selected plants grown as biofilters, may help remove some of the selenium and other elements from the drainage water. The trees and biofilter crops, irrigated with drainage water on a given percentage of land, would also reduce the total requirements for irrigation water supplied by canals and rivers (for example, a 100 acre farm with 10% agroforestry would require fresh irrigation water for only 90 acres of crops). Consequently, agroforestry would also reduce the amount of salts brought into the San Joaquin Valley with fresh water deliveries.

In addition to assisting farmers with the management of drainage and salinity problems, the trees can also provide: (1) a marketable commodity in the form of harvested biomass, (2) windbreaks, (3) a wildlife habitat amid flat farmland, and (4) an opportunity for farmers to gain additional income from beekeeping or establishing hunting areas for sportsmen.

Fast-growing eucalyptus and casuarina trees may produce up to 15 to 20 tons biomass per acre per year, although under saline conditions yields can be expected to be lower, yet still substantial, amounts. The plantations are still too young at this point to determine actual yields, but it is apparent that land which might otherwise be either not cultivated or kept as evaporation ponds can instead be utilized productively. The plantations may also help the farmer by providing effective windbreaks to help protect adjacent crops and reduce soil erosion.

The wildlife study being conducted as part of this program indicates that many birds and small mammals are using the trees for shelter. The study will continue to determine the wildlife uses of the plantations as well as the possible effects of the drainage water irrigation on wildlife. Farmers may also obtain additional income through the management of the plantations for game hunting or bee hives.

The demonstration plantations, planted in 1985, 1986, and 1987, are now becoming mature enough so that positive results can be observed. Preliminary analyses of the data obtained from the program thus far indicate that:

1. Drainage water can be used to irrigate the trees.
2. Once established, trees can use ground water from higher water tables and do not need to be irrigated; planting of trees as water flow interceptors needs to be further studied.
3. Trees can be used to manage a water/salt balance; the system needs to be further studied.
4. Trees are growing at rates of 1/3 foot to 2/3 foot or more per month, depending on soil and growing conditions.


## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) and the United States Department of Agriculture - Soil Conservation Service (USDA - SCS) are currently conducting research on the potential use of agroforestry as an option to help San Joaquin Valley farmers manage drainage water and salinity problems. The use of agroforestry for this purpose is based on salinity management practices used in world regions with soil and climatic conditions similar to those in California.

Irrigation of farmland creates the need to leach accumulated salts from the soil in order to allow the continued production of crops. Problems in the San Joaquin Valley involve shallow ground water tables created when saline water accumulates above low-permeable clay layers in the soil. These high water tables must be lowered below crop root zones in order to prevent losses in production. Additional problems involve potentially harmful elements, such as selenium and boron, which may be contained in this saline water.

The Agroforestry Demonstration Program currently underway is testing and evaluating the feasibility of utilizing trees to reduce the amount of agricultural drainage water generated within the San Joaquin Valley. Salt-tolerant trees have the potential to lower the water table and reduce the volume of this drainage water through evapotranspiration and consumptive uses. Agroforestry can therefore lower the costs of drainage water management by reducing the amount of water which must be treated and/or disposed of in evaporation ponds, solar ponds, or deep-injection wells. Figure 1 illustrates the potential of the agroforestry system to reduce both the volume of drainage water and the volume of irrigation water used on farms in the San Joaquin Valley.

FIGURE 1



The trees can contribute to more than just the reduction of water volume. They can also help increase the production of conventional crops by lowering high water tables. Additionally, the trees, in combination with selected plants grown as biofilters, may help remove some of the selenium and other elements from the drainage water. The trees and biofilter crops, irrigated with drainage water on a given percentage of land, would also reduce the total requirements for irrigation water supplied by canals and rivers (for example, a 100 acre farm with 10% agroforestry would require fresh irrigation water for only 90 acres of crops). Consequently, agroforestry would also reduce the amount of salts brought into the San Joaquin Valley with fresh water deliveries.

In addition to assisting farmers with the management of drainage and salinity problems, the trees can also provide: (1) a marketable commodity in the form of harvested biomass, (2) windbreaks, (3) a wildlife habitat amid flat farmland, and (4) an opportunity for farmers to gain additional income from beekeeping or establishing hunting areas for sportsmen.

Fast-growing eucalyptus and casuarina trees may produce up to 15 to 20 tons biomass per acre per year, although under saline conditions yields can be expected to be lower, yet still substantial, amounts. The plantations are still too young at this point to determine actual yields, but it is apparent that land which might otherwise be either not cultivated or kept as evaporation ponds can instead be utilized productively. The plantations may also help the farmer by providing effective windbreaks to help protect adjacent crops and reduce soil erosion.

The wildlife study being conducted as part of this program indicates that many birds and small mammals are using the trees for shelter. The study will continue to determine the wildlife uses of the plantations as well as the possible effects of the drainage water irrigation on wildlife. Farmers may also obtain additional income through the management of the plantations for game hunting or bee hives.

The demonstration plantations, planted in 1985, 1986, and 1987, are now becoming mature enough so that positive results can be observed. Preliminary analyses of the data obtained from the program thus far indicate that:

1. Drainage water can be used to irrigate the trees.
2. Once established, trees can use ground water from higher water tables and do not need to be irrigated; planting of trees as water flow interceptors needs to be further studied.
3. Trees can be used to manage a water/salt balance; the system needs to be further studied.
4. Trees are growing at rates of 1/3 foot to 2/3 foot or more per month, depending on soil and growing conditions.

5. Tree plantations attract wildlife; the interaction of plantations and wildlife needs to be further studied from both economic and ecological standpoints.
6. Trees can recover from the damage of cotton defoliants.
7. Weed control is needed mostly during the first year.
8. Tree production may be a low cost operation, especially considering the economic aspects of drainage water management.
9. Trees offer an opportunity for economic use of land.
10. Power and pulp companies are expressing an interest in contracting with growers for supplies of biomass; composition of the biomass and environmental effects of its conversion need to be studied.
11. Trees and biofilter plants may provide an opportunity to diversify production and marketing options.
12. Biofilter crops potentially uptake selenium; the feasibility of using "selenium enriched" forage for livestock needs to be studied.

The challenge of salinity and drainage water problems needs to be addressed at the on-farm level. The solution can be found in a combination of measures, such as irrigation management, agroforestry, biofilter crops, and water treatment or disposal facilities, all of which would operate as a system. This approach may also offer an opportunity to manage selenium and other elements as resources rather than hazardous waste.

The goal of the Agroforestry Demonstration Program is to develop a practical farming solution to drainage and salinity problems in order to maintain the viability of the agriculture industry in the San Joaquin Valley.

\* \* \*

## Acknowledgement

The Agroforestry Demonstration Program has been partially funded by the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program (SJVDP) and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The California Department of Forestry (CDF) has been supplying a portion of the seedlings required and the Department of Water Resources (DWR) has committed additional financial support for the program. The United States Department of Agriculture - Soil Conservation Service (USDA - SCS) and the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) enjoy the cooperation of farmers and numerous professionals working in the private sector, federal and state agencies, and universities. This report was produced in order to document the progress of the San Joaquin Valley Agroforestry Demonstration Program for the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, in compliance with the agreement between the CDFA and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, and for other interested individuals and agencies.

\*

\*

\*

## 1.0 Introduction

The agroforestry demonstration program for the management of saline drainage water was introduced in the San Joaquin Valley during the spring of 1985 and is scheduled to continue through at least 1991. Twenty-one trial plantations, ranging in size from less than one acre to 28 acres and totaling about 179 acres, include plantings of eucalyptus, casuarina, poplar, mesquite, and Elderica pine. These trial plantations are located on private farms. Seeds for Eucalyptus camaldulensis, the most commonly planted species of eucalyptus, were obtained from the Lake Albacutya, Mt. Bernstead, and Alice Springs areas of Australia. Casuarina seeds were obtained from both Australia and Egypt. The poplar cuttings and mesquite seedlings were obtained from two commercial nurseries and the University of California, Riverside.

Fresh water is used to irrigate the seedlings during the first year in order to establish the trees. Thereafter, the trees receive saline drainage water and/or they directly utilize ground water from high water tables. The level of weed control varies from farm to farm, as does the application of fertilizers and amendments. The trees show hardy growth under a variety of conditions and have problems only in the most highly saline areas of some fields.

A comprehensive 5-year program has been implemented for monitoring the soil, water, and plant conditions. Levels of ground water are measured at regular intervals and laboratory tests are conducted on samples of soil, water, and plant tissues. The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), the U.S. Department of Agriculture - Soil Conservation Service (USDA-SCS), and the California State University, Fresno - Center for Irrigation Technology (CSUF-CIT) gather the monitored data. The farm reports (Sections 4.0 through 4.13) show some of this data, including planting history and the depth of ground water and its electric conductivity. The trends of the monitored data are continuously analyzed. Tabular and graphical presentations of some of these results are included in several of the farm reports. Contracts have been signed with Dellavalle Laboratories, Inc., for analysis of soil, water, and plant tissue samples and CSUF-CIT for water monitoring.

In March of 1987 a report on the agroforestry program was presented at the Pacific Region Meeting of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers in Tucson, Arizona. This report, along with additional information on the agroforestry program, can be found in the April 1987 progress report, available upon request from the Agricultural Resources Branch of the CDFA.

\* \* \*





## 2.0 Present Status of the Agroforestry Demonstration Program

As mentioned previously, the Agroforestry Demonstration Program includes approximately 179 acres of trees planted on 21 farms. Table 1 lists the size and county of participating farms along with planting information and portions of the program in which each farm participates. The map in Section 4.0 indicates the locations of the individual farms and the farm reports in Sections 4.1 through 4.13 give more detailed accounts of the plantings. Typical eucalyptus and casuarina trees are shown in the photographs in Figure 2.

In addition to the trial field plantings, which include monitoring and laboratory analyses of soil, water, and plant samples, the Agroforestry Demonstration Program is conducting research studies on other aspects of agroforestry. All of these activities are oriented toward the successful integration of agroforestry farming practices in the San Joaquin Valley. These projects include:

1. the selection and propagation of superior performing trees (Section 5.0)
2. the economic analysis of agroforestry and marketing of value-added agroforestry products (Section 6.0)
3. the study of the wildlife uses of the plantations, the economic and other values of the wildlife, and the potential effects of contaminants in drainage water on this wildlife (Section 7.0)
4. the study of the salt and water balance of the system (Section 8.0)
5. the study of biofilter crops for the management of drainage water within the framework of agroforestry and of livestock feeding trials with harvested forage in selenium deficient areas (Section 9.0)
6. the study of biomass characteristics, the distribution of elements, such as selenium, within the biomass, and the ultimate destiny of these elements after biomass utilization (potential for air pollution, etc.)

Contracts have been signed between the CDFA and the University of California, Davis (UCD) and California State University, Fresno (CSUF) to perform these research studies. The University of Arizona (UA), Tuscon is involved in the biofilter study. The biomass study is scheduled to start in 1988 at UCD.

TABLE 1 Agroforestry Program Demonstration Plantations

FARM	COUNTY	ACREAGE IN TREES	YEAR PLANTED					TYPES OF TREES PLANTED					LABORATORY ANALYSES			USDA-SCS WATER TABLE		INTENSIVE WATER MONITORING		WATER/SALT BALANCE STUDY		SELECTION OF TREES FOR PROPAGATION			HALOPHYTE BIOFILTER TRIAL
			1985	1986	1987	Euc	Cas	Pop	Mes	Pine	Soil	Water	Plant Tissue	Depth	EC	(CSUF)	WILDLIFE STUDY	BALANCE STUDY	1987	1988					
Murrieta	Fresno	23.3	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Peck	Fresno	8.2	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Thomsen	Fresno	15		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Allen	Fresno	5	X	X		X	X	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Gowen	Fresno	1	X			X	X	X																	
Meyers	Fresno	28			X	X																			
Verdigaal	Kings	8		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Carollo	Kings	10		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Haynes	Kings	11.3		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Kings Boys Ranch	Kings	2		X			X																		
Stratford P.U.	Kings	7			X	X	X																		
Orton	Kings	4			X	X	X																		
Tulare Lake D.D.	Kings	3.4			X	X	X	X																	
Stanton	Kings	2			X	X	X																		
Rowan	Kings	2			X	X	X																		
Rio Vista	Kings	1.2			X	X	X																		
Van Groninger	Kings	<1			X	X																			
Buttonwillow	Kern	4.5		X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Bloenhof	Kern	19		X		X	X	X																	
Williams	Kern	13		X		X	X	X		X															
Way	Kern	12		X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		

21 Farms, Total Acreage = 179.9 acres

FIGURE 2

San Joaquin Valley Field Sites for the  
Agroforestry Demonstration Program



EUCALYPTUS TREES



CASUARINA TREES

Funding for these research projects and the field trials and associated analyses has been obtained from grants by the CDFA, the USDA-SCS, the Federal - State San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program (SJVDP), the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and the Department of Water Resources (DWR). The California Department of Forestry (CDF) has contributed over 80,000 seedlings to the program, with a cash value of approximately \$32,500. Table 2 lists the contributions of these agencies and Table 3 shows the activities supported by each of the funding sources, along with the names of the contracted institutions and the investigators.

The CDFA has been keeping records on the expenditures and reimbursements for the previously mentioned activities. Financial summaries for this information are included in Section 10.0.

Other agencies are also supporting the Agroforestry Demonstration Program with contributions such as supplying seedlings or providing consulting services. All of the participants and their activities are included in Table 4. Section 11.0 contains a directory of the individual Agroforestry Program participants.

TABLE 2 Funding for the Agroforestry Program  
(October 1987)

<u>FUNDING AGENCY</u>	<u>CONTRIBUTION</u>
CDFA	\$ 95,000
SJVDP	60,000
SWRCB	50,000
USDA-SCS	15,000
DWR	9,500
CDF	32,500 (equivalent)
	-----
total funding	\$262,000

TABLE 3 Agroforestry Program Grants and Activities

FUNDING SOURCE	ACTIVITY	INSTITUTION OR COMPANY UNDER CONTRACT	INVESTIGATORS
CDF	Provide seedling	n/a	Gene Hartzel
SWRCB	Analysis of samples	Dellavalle Labs	n/a
	Seedling purchases	Contracted and non-contracted commercial nurseries	n/a
	Other field trial related expenses	n/a	n/a
SJVDP	Selection and propagation of trees	UCD	Dr. R. Sachs Dr. R. Woodward M. Merwin (ITCI)
	Economic study	UCD (direct salary payment)	Dr. J. Wilen Luanne Lohr
	Wildlife study	CSUF	Dr. D. Chesemore Andy Dyer
CDFA	Salt & water balance	UCD	Dr. K. Tanji
		CSUF	Dr. S. Gratton Dr. K. Solomon Dr. G. Jorgensen
	Water monitoring	CSUF	Dr. K. Solomon Dr. G. Jorgensen
USDA-SCS	Analyses Equipment	USDA Laboratory Lincoln, Neb.	Fresno, Hanford & Bakersfield Offices
DWR	Evapotranspiration study	UCD	Dr. S. Gratton

TABLE 4 Participating Agencies

<u>PARTICIPANT</u>		<u>ACTIVITIES</u>
CDFA	-California Department of Food & Agriculture	-Administration -Funding -Consultation in plant pathology
USDA-SCS	-USDA-Soil Conservation Service	-Tree planting -Monitoring field trials -Funding -Relations with participating farmers
CDF	-California Department of Forestry	-Consulting -Seedlings
SJVDP	-Federal-State San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program	-Funding -Consulting
SWRCB	-State Water Resource Control Board	-Funding -Consulting
DWR	-Department of Water Resources	-Funding -Consulting
USBR	-U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation	-Consulting
USFW	-U.S. Fish & Wildlife	-Consulting
USDA-FS	-USDA Forest Service	-Consulting -Economic study
CVRQCB	-Central Valley Regional Quality Control Board	-Consulting -Quality control in lab testing
DOC	-Department of Conservation	-Consulting
DFG	-Department of Fish & Game	-Consulting
UCD	-University of California, Davis	-Research
UCR	-University of California, Riverside	-Consulting -Seedlings

(continued on next page)

TABLE 4 Participating Agencies (continued)

<u>PARTICIPANT</u>		<u>ACTIVITIES</u>
UCB	-University of California, Berkeley Dept. of Forestry	-Consulting
CSUF	-California State University, Fresno	-Research -Consulting
	-CSUF Experimental Range Station	-Consulting -Use of Se enriched forage
UA	-University of Arizona	-Research -Consulting
CFF	-Chapman Forestry Foundation	-Consulting -Seedlings
ITCI	-International Tree Crop Institute	-Seeds -Assist in propagation of casuarina

\*

\*

\*





### 3.0 Future Plans for the Agroforestry Demonstration Program

The agroforestry system needs to be tested and evaluated over several growing seasons. It is scheduled to continue through at least 1991, at which time the field plantations will have begun to reach maturity and all of the individual projects should be completed. Trees and biofilter crops will be harvested and analyzed for yield, composition, contaminants, economic value, and regrowth efficiencies. This program will develop practical field data on the agroforestry system, including information on agricultural water management and salinity control, integration of agroforestry with technologies for final treatment or disposal of drainage water, guidelines for the management of the plantations and biofilters, establishment of seed plantations, the processing of biomass into marketable commodities, and the development of markets for these products. Workshops will be organized and literature will be prepared to help disseminate this information to the farmers. The program also includes studies to investigate the environmental effects of the agroforestry system on wildlife and farming.

The goals of the Agroforestry Demonstration Program will be accomplished with the following activities:

- continue the detailed laboratory analyses of water, soil, and plant tissue on selected farms
- expand the quality assurance program for laboratory analyses
- continue intensive monitoring of water conditions on selected farms
- continue analysis of the monitored data from the demonstration plantations
- continue the economic and marketing study
- conduct the water/salt balance study, including the investigation of evapotranspiration characteristics of trees and biofilter crops
- continue selection of outstanding trees on farms which have been irrigated with drainage water for more than one year
- further test the selected trees in the laboratory
- propagate these trees and establish seed plantations in the San Joaquin Valley in order to have a local material source for further expansion of the plantings
- continue the wildlife study, including monitoring the wildlife in tree plantations of different ages, analyzing for contaminants in wildlife and their food chains, and

evaluating the economic value of agroforestry for additional income from hunting

- test halophytes as biofilters for uptake of selenium, and conduct feeding trials to investigate potential uses of the biofilter crops as selenium enriched forage for livestock in those areas of California which are selenium deficient
- characterize the biomass for its potential for conversion into marketable products, including the technology and economics of the conversion and the environmental impacts of biomass production and utilization
- coordinate with SWRCB, SJVDP, Westlands Water District, and other agencies the integration of agroforestry farming methods with the technologies considered for final removal and disposal of the salts concentrated in the reduced volume of drainage water
- study the feasibility of handling selenium and other elements (contained in the drainage water) as resources rather than waste materials
- organize workshops and prepare literature on agroforestry and its potential to help San Joaquin Valley farmers with the management of irrigation and drainage water and the development of marketable commodities

The Agroforestry Demonstration Program consists of several inter-related projects coordinated towards finding a practical farming solution to drainage and salinity problems. This program will help keep farming viable and will support the development of a new agriucture-based industry in the San Joaquin Valley.

\* \* \*

#### 4.0 Progress of the Field Trials

Thus far, trees planted for the agroforestry program have shown rapid growth, with average heights of 4 to 7 feet in their first six months of growth. Some outstanding trees, usually growing in the better soils, stand 10 feet high or more when six months old. Other trees have suffered from problems such as highly saline soils or ground water or damage from the drift of cotton defoliant. Hot weather and lack of immediate irrigation at planting time caused high mortality of seedlings planted on some farms late in the season. From these experiences guidelines are being developed for planting and care during the first year so that seedling mortality can be reduced. Once established, the trees seem to thrive, even those with minimal care, and the trees suffering from cotton defoliant damage have surprisingly sprouted vigorous new growth.

The apparent low maintenance requirements indicate that the production of these trees is a low cost operation. Weed control is needed mostly during the first year. After this the trees seem to out-compete the weeds. The trees also seem to maintain high growth rates even while being irrigated with saline drainage water of up to 10,000 ppm TDS. The demonstration plantations have created an interest among farmers, some of whom wish to plant more trees. The effects of varying degrees of care and soil conditions on tree growth can be observed in the following farm reports (Sections 4.1 through 4.13), the first nine of which include brief summaries of the plantations.

The map displays the Hanford and Kings County area in California. Key features include:

- Counties:** Fresno County to the north, Kings County to the west, and Kern County to the east.
- Towns:** Hanford, Mendota, Fresno, Kings, Wasco, Shafter, and Bakersfield.
- Wildlife Refuges:** Hanford Wildlife Management Area, Kings National Wildlife Refuge, and Pinyon National Wildlife Refuge.
- Demonstration Plantations:** Marked with triangles, including locations like Kings, Wasco, and Shafter.
- Towns:** Marked with circles, including Hanford, Kings, Wasco, Shafter, and Bakersfield.
- USCA-SCS Office:** Marked with a circle containing a dot, located in Hanford.
- Roads:** Major roads are shown with route numbers (e.g., 99, 41, 15, 198, 199).
- Legend:**
  - ▲ Demonstration plantation
  - Town
  - ⊙ USCA-SCS Office
  - ▨ Wildlife refuge
- Inset Map:** A small map of California in the bottom left corner, with a box indicating the location of the study area in the Central Valley.

#### 4.1 Murrieta Farms

Murrieta Farms has put much effort into their 24 acres of agroforestry plantings and thus they exemplify an intensively cared for plantation. The field site, which includes 1985 and 1986 plantings of several species and seed sources of eucalyptus, casuarina, and poplar, has been both hand weeded and sprayed with herbicides (both Fusilade and a mixture of Goal and Roundup). The lower lateral limbs are pruned and the trees have received some fertilizer. Although fresh irrigation water was used during the first year of growth, the trees now receive drainage water diluted with fresh water to reduce the salinity to approximately 10,000 ppm. The trees are growing well and typical trees have been harvested to determine the biomass yield.

The USDA-SCS in Fresno has provided soil and water analyses on Murrieta Farms. Detailed analyses have been run on soil and water samples. These are included in the following farm report. In addition to the detailed analyses, monthly readings of water table depth and electric conductivity (EC) of ground water are taken by CSUF - CIT.

Several of the fastest growing trees have been harvested to provide cuttings for the tree selection and propagation trials at UCD. This project is further described in Section 5.0.

This plantation is also included in the wildlife study being conducted by the CSUF - Department of Biology. Many birds and small mammals have been seen in the area and several bird nests have been found in the casuarina trees. Refer to the report in Section 7.0 for a more complete description of this program.

A field of saltbush (Atriplex) was planted on the farm in co-operation with the University of Arizona (UA). This has been harvested in two cuttings for a total production rate of about 3 tons per acre. The forage has been fed to sheep and cattle on the ranch, which appear to like the hay. Detailed analyses are being run to determine the constituents and nutritional value of the plants in order to determine their suitability as a biofilter crop. A description of this project is included in Section 9.0.

Murrieta Farms has been chosen as the field site for the salt/water balance study being conducted by researchers at UCD, CSUF - CIT, and UA, Tucson. This research will help track the water, salts, and elements going into and coming out of the agroforestry system. A tile drainage system will be installed under the agroforestry and biofilter site in order to conduct the study. Evapotranspiration values of trees and biofilter plants will also be measured. A more detailed outline of this project is included with the Salt/Water Balance project description in Section 8.0.

drain pump

field road


4-4

field road

# MURRIETA FARMS AGROFORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PLANTINGS

field road

Atriplex Nursery	vacant	
3 rows Casuarina, various species, 7-2-85		
7 rows Eucalyptus camaldulensis (Lake Albacutya), San Joaquin Foliage, 7/85		road
3 rows Casuarina, Cornflower Farms, 7-10-86		
8 rows E. camaldulensis, 7-10-86		
7 rows E. camaldulensis (Lake Albacutya), San Joaquin Foliage, 5-8-86		road
9 rows E. camaldulensis (Lake Albacutya), San Joaquin Foliage, 5-8-86		
11 rows E. camaldulensis (Alice Springs), San Joaquin Foliage, 5-7-86		road
1 row E. camaldulensis (Alice Springs), San Joaquin Foliage, 5-7-86 Elderica Pine (93 plants), 8-10-87		
1 row E. camaldulensis (Alice Springs), San Joaquin Foliage, 5-7-86		
20 rows E. camaldulensis (Lake Albacutya), Ca. Dept. of Forestry, 5-8-86		Road
11 rows E. camaldulensis (Lake Albacutya), Ca. Dept. of Forestry, 5-8-86		
1 row Eucalyptus grandis, Cornflower Farms, 5-8-86; Elderica Pine (72 plants) 8-15-87		



560 feet

2640 feet

not to scale

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY

file: AGFOMURI

last update 9/8/87

county: FRESNO

farm: MURRIETA acreage: 23.3 av.tr/ac: 1560

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-gla	CAS-cun	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	32900	1085	0	138	855	1376	0	36354
7/2/85	CORNFL	ITCI					855			
7/22/85	CDF			285						
8/19/85	SJV	L.ALBACUT	3200							
2/24/86	CHAPMAN	FORSTER						415		
3/4/86	ZAPATTINI	4 VAR'S						961		
3/4/86	CORNFL	CHAPMAN				138				
5/7/86	SJV	L.ALBACUT	29700							
5/8/86	CORNFL	"ROSE GUM"		800						

Mo./Yr.

3/87

7/87

## Comments:

some frost damage on new 2-yr-old tree roots  
 growth, some trees staked in water table, no  
 Alice Springs 2' shorter stress w/ reduced  
 than Lake Al., possibly irrig.,  
 crossed w/ E. globulus

SOILS Mo./Yr.

9/86

3/87

7/87

## Lab Analysis:

see MURISOIL &  
 "Work Plan..."  
 in file for  
 site description

See May '86 analysis  
 of soil before plan-  
 ting in MURISOIL

## Amendments:

-

none

## Fertilizer:

Foloplex applied  
 in August '86

none

aerially applied urea  
 @ 60lb/ac, no date  
 results impressive

## IRRIGATION WATER

Mo./Yr.

1985

3/87

7/87

## Lab Analysis:

-

after drains plugged water to trees is  
 ppm = 10,000-12,000 ~7 to 9 ppt salts, Se hi  
 in Spring bef. irrig.

## Amount &amp;

yearly total of 16 acre season total = 3 acft

## Frequency:

feet for 3.5 acres 6 irrigations

# WATER TABLE

Depth (feet):

	23-Sep-85	09-Oct-85	21-Nov-85	19-Dec-85		10-Feb-86	24-Mar-86			
	Sep-85	Oct-85	Nov-85	Dec-85	Jan-86	Feb-86	Mar-86	Apr-86	May-86	Jun-86
WEST END	4.83	5.83	5.00	6.17		6.75	5.75			
EAST END	5.50	5.00	4.92	5.67		5.92	5.83			
				29-Oct-86		30-Dec-86				
	Jul-86	Aug-86	Sep-86	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87			
WEST END				5.50		5.92				
EAST END				5.50		5.75				
	26-Feb-87		16-Apr-87	27-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87				
	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87				
WEST END	8.67		5.00	3.58	4.42	5.33				
EAST END	9.00		4.75	3.33	5.00	5.58				

7/87 letter states that water table in area has lowered due to drains being blocked (court order), water table varies according to irrigation of nearby lands where drain blocked

## Lab Analysis

Electric Conductivity (Ec) of Ground water

	23-Sep-85	09-Oct-85	21-Nov-85	19-Dec-85		10-Feb-86	24-Mar-86			
	Sep-85	Oct-85	Nov-85	Dec-85	Jan-86	Feb-86	Mar-86	Apr-86	May-86	Jun-86
WEST END	15.2	19.2	20.1	21.1		19.5	11.0			
EAST END	6.4	6.4	7.8	6.4		11.3	3.3			

SAMPLE #026

SAMPLE #027

22.5

29.6

See "MURIWATR"  
for more detail

				29-Oct-86		30-Dec-86				
	Jul-86	Aug-86	Sep-86	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87			
WEST END				21.2		19.4				
EAST END				4.3		3.4				
	26-Feb-87		16-Apr-87	27-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87				
	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87				
WEST END	14.5		12.7	20.5	25.5	10.8				
EAST END	15.5		17.5	16.2	25.5	28.0				



TREES

Growth:

2/15/87

TREE	ROW	AVE. HT.	AVE. DBH
------	-----	----------	----------

Casuarina	1	8.4'	1.2"
	2	9.1'	1.3"

Eucalyptus (Lake Albacutya)	1	9.6'	1.4"
	2	9.0'	1.4"
	3	9.6'	1.5"
	4	9.9'	1.5"
	5	9.5'	1.5"

overall averages		9.5'	1.5"
------------------	--	------	------

(rows of trees measured from north to south)

in 7/87, growth was estimated to be ~ 1/2 rate expected in soils w/o salt problems

Mo./Yr.	3/87
---------	------

Lab Analysis:	
---------------	--

wood	-
------	---

leaves	-
--------	---

WEEDS	Mo./Yr.	9/86	3/87
-------	---------	------	------


		Fusilade applied in	no problem
--	--	---------------------	------------

		July & August, see	hand weeded
--	--	--------------------	-------------

		file for detail map	
--	--	---------------------	--


# WATER TABLE DEPTH

MURRIETA FARMS



# EC OF GROUND WATER

MURRIETA FARMS



## MURRIETA FARMS

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: MURIWATR

last update: 9/18/87

## WATER DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	EC x 1000	SATURATED									TOTAL
			Na	SAR	PASTE	Ca	Mg	K	Cl	SO4	NO3	SALTS
			(units?)		(units?)	(units?)	(units?)	(units?)	(units?)	(units?)	(units?)	(units?)
May 1986	026	22.5	343.9	56	2.3	35.3	40.8	0.2	238.9	174.1	12.4	1.1
	027	29.6	194.5	39	2.9	30.8	19.4	0.3	90.8	154.4		1.6

## Depth (feet):

	23-Sep-85	09-Oct-85	21-Nov-85	19-Dec-85		10-Feb-86	24-Mar-86	
	Sep-85	Oct-85	Nov-85	Dec-85	Jan-86	Feb-86	Mar-86	Apr-86
WEST END	4.83	5.83	5.00	6.17		6.75	5.75	
EAST END	5.50	5.00	4.92	5.67		5.92	5.83	
						29-Oct-86		30-Dec-86
	May-86	Jun-86	Jul-86	Aug-86	Sep-86	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86
WEST END						5.50		5.92
EAST END						5.50		5.75
	Jan-87	26-Feb-87		16-Apr-87	27-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87	
		Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87	
WEST END		8.67		5.00	3.58	4.42	5.33	
EAST END		9.00		4.75	3.33	5.00	5.58	

7/87 letter states that water table in area has lowered due to drains being blocked (court order), water table varies according to irrigation of nearby lands where drain blocked

## Electric Conductivity (Ec) of Ground water

	23-Sep-85	09-Oct-85	21-Nov-85	19-Dec-85		10-Feb-86	24-Mar-86		
	Sep-85	Oct-85	Nov-85	Dec-85	Jan-86	Feb-86	Mar-86	Apr-86	May-86
WEST END	15.2	19.2	20.1	21.1		19.5	11.0		
EAST END	6.4	6.4	7.8	6.4		11.3	3.3		
SAMPLE #026									22.5
SAMPLE #027									29.6
									See "MURIWATR"
									for more detail

					29-Oct-86		30-Dec-86	
	Jun-86	Jul-86	Aug-86	Sep-86	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87
WEST END					21.2		19.4	
EAST END					4.3		3.4	
	26-Feb-87		16-Apr-87	27-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87		
	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87		
WEST END	14.5		12.7	20.5	25.5	10.8		
EAST END	15.5		17.5	16.2	25.5	28.0		

## SOIL DATA

## Chemical Analysis

Trace Elements-Inductively Coupled Plasma Spectrophotometry  
before planting (1985?)

	Al	As	B	Cd	Cr	Cu	Fe
SAMPLE #	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml
87P470	0.2	0	24.5	0	0	0.2	0.4
87P471	0.6	0	10.1	0	0	0.1	0.9
	Hg	Mn	Mo	Pb	Se	Si	Zn
	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml	ug/ml
87P470	0	0.1	0.1	0	0.8	11.4	0.5
87P471	0	0.1	0.1	0	0.2	12.8	0.1

DATE: MAY 1986

Units not shown

Soil samples from before planting

Summary of USDA-SCS report

SAMPLE #	15 BAR	Ca	Mg	Na	K	Cl	SO4	NO3	TOTAL SALTS	EC
DEPTH (inches)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
#001										
0 - 5.91	21.3	3.6	1.1	20.8	0.2	8.7	16.4		0.2	2.55
5.91 - 15.76	21.1	17.7	4.6	79.2	0.4	8.5	93.6		0.9	8.66
15.76 - 30.73	22.3	22.7	4.6	103.3	0.8	16.4	115.2		1.1	10.73
30.73 - 48.07	20.9	22.5	4.2	105.1	0.2	16.8	115.7		1.1	10.86
48.07 - 65.01	20.2	23.3	5.4	124.4	0.2	27.5	126.1		1	12.55
#002										
0 - 5.91	18.9	8.8	1	14.7	0.2	8.7	11.9		0.1	1.94
5.91 - 23.64	21.4	20.3	4.7	85.3	0.4	13.7	25.6		0.9	9.15
23.64 - 47.28	21.7	21.5	4.3	102.1	0.3	18.4	110.3		1.2	10.44
#003										
0 - 5.91	19.9	9	2.5	25.1	0.3	4.3	29.2		0.2	3.46
5.91 - 23.64	21.1	20.8	5	71.1	0.4	7.1	88.1	0.4	0.7	7.96
23.64 - 47.28	20.4	5	1.6	21.8	0.2	3.8	19.4		0.1	2.78
#004										
0 - 5.91	19.4	21.4	4.3	106	0.3	13.4	120		1	10.74
5.91 - 23.64	20.9	20.4	5	69	0.4	6.5	86.9		0.8	7.79
23.64 - 47.28	20.1	17.4	4	87.9	0.3	12.7	96.8		0.8	9.28
#005										
0 - 5.91	20.2	4.7	1.5	23.9	0.3	4.1	20.1		0.2	2.27
5.91 - 23.64	21.5	14.3	3.4	64.7	0.3	8.1	74.8		0.9	7.23
23.64 - 47.28	22.3	21.3	4.2	93	0.2	14.9	103.8		1.2	9.78

SAMPLE #									TOTAL	
DEPTH (inches)	15 BAR	Ca	Mg	Na	K	Cl	SO4	NO3	SALTS	EC
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
#006										
0 - 5.91	18.1	4.9	1.2	10.7	0.2	1.2	12		0.1	1.66
5.91 - 23.64	21	22.4	6	61.5	0.4	3.7	85.5		0.5	7.33
23.64 - 47.28	21.8	20.5	5.3	81.7	0.4	7.8	116.7		0.9	9.68
#007										
0 - 5.91	21.3	1.3	0.5	14.1	0.2	4.2	4.9		0.1	1.63
5.91 - 23.64	20.9	21.8	5.6	86.7	0.4	14.5	99.5		0.9	9.42
23.64 - 47.28	21.1	21.9	4.9	107.8	0.3	24.2	112.6		1.1	11.1
#008										
0 - 5.91	21.5	1.6	0.5	10.4	0.2	2	2.4		0.1	1.25
5.91 - 23.64	20.6	9.3	2.9	55.5	0.2	5.7	60.8		0.6	6.26
23.64 - 47.28	21.6	4.3	5.2	102.7	0.2	14.2	111.4	0.8	1.1	10.64
#009										
0 - 5.91	19.7	3.0	0.8	9.4	0.2	1.0	10.4		0.1	1.39
5.91 - 23.64	20.0	17.7	4.7	45.3	0.4	2.4	63.2	0.4	0.4	5.77
23.64 - 47.28	23.2	21.0	5.1	83.8	0.3	7.8	105.3	0.8	1.0	9.23
#010										
0 - 5.91	20.4	11.9	3.3	18.2	0.4	2.2	29	0.3	0.2	3.08
5.91 - 23.64	22.1	5.8	2.1	36.2	0.2	4	38.7	1.6	0.4	4.87
23.64 - 47.28	21.8	21.8	6.1	93.6	0.2	9.4	111	0.9	0.9	9.9
#011										
0 - 5.91	19.8	3.3	0.8	8.9	0.2	2	8.8		0.1	1.35
5.91 - 23.64	1	19.4	5.2	81.4	0.4	8.2	93.1		0.8	3.84
23.64 - 47.28	21.2	20.3	4.4	109.8	0.3	12.2	122.7		1	11.11

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH	EC X 1000	CATIONS	ALIQOT	VERSINATE	Ca+Mg	Na	SAR	ESP
		inches		meq/l		mls	meq/l	meq/l		
4-8-86	MB0	0	3.0	33	2	1.2	12	21	9	11
	MB1	12	3.6	40	2	0.4	4	36	25	25
	MB2	24	9.6	118	2	3.0	30	88	23	24
	MB3	36	12.8	160	2	3.1	31	129	33	33
4-8-86	MA0	0	2.2	23	2	0.8	8	15	7.5	9
	MA1	12	8.2	98	2	3.2	32	66	16.5	17
	MA2	24	13.3	165	2	2.9	29	136	36	34
	MA3	36	14.8	188	2	3.2	32	156	39	36

#### 4.2 Peck Ranch


While Murrieta Farms exemplifies the intensively cared for plantation, Peck Ranch is an example of a neglected agroforestry planting. Although this farm site was well planned at the time of planting in 1985, due to a change of management it now receives little maintenance. Yet a surprising number of trees have survived heavy weed competition, damage from cotton defoliants, irrigation with saline water of up to 18,000 ppm TDS during the first year, and other hardships. This helps show the hardiness of the trees and the lack of upkeep they can tolerate.

The 8+ acre Peck plantation of eucalyptus and casuarina is located adjacent to 160 acres of evaporation ponds. The original plan was to allow the trees to establish with fresh irrigation water during the first year, and then to utilize the water from the adjacent pond. But the seedlings were accidentally irrigated with pond water during the first year. Defoliant, which drifted from nearby cotton fields, caused severe leaf damage in the fall of 1985. With no weed control implemented, many weeds took over the field, including morning glory, sunflower, lambsquarter, ragweed, and cocklebur. The heavy competition, with some plants overtopping or crawling up the branches of the trees, appears to have reduced tree growth. Yet, despite the lack of care this plantation has received, the trees stand at a density of around 50% of the original plantings. Surviving trees had reached the average heights of 7' 8" and 5' 6" for casuarina and eucalyptus, respectively, in March of 1987.

Although care of the farm has been neglected, the USDA-SCS in Fresno has continued to monitor the water table depth and electric conductivity as well as run several detailed soil and water analyses. These can be found in the following farm report. Students from CSUF - CIT began monthly monitoring of the water table in August 1987.

Trees from the Peck field trial have also been cut for the selection and propagation trials at UCD which are further discussed in Section 5.0. This farm is also part of the wildlife study.

# PECK RANCH AGROFORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PLANTINGS



## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/4/87

file: AGFOPECK

county: FRESNO

farm: PECK                      acreage: 8.2                      av. tr/ac: 1052

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUIT	gr. tot.
		total:	7700	0	0	75	0	0	0	7775
7/2/85	CORNFL	ITCI					855			
7/22/85	planted 400	Euc, no more info								
8/19/85	SJN	L.ALBACUT	6000							
9/9/85	SJN	L.ALBACUT	1700							
3/4/86	CORNFL	CHAPMAN				75				

## Comments

Mo./Yr                      3/87  
lots of weed competition  
approx. stand density  
of 50%, cotton defoliant  
damage in fall 1985

## SOILS

Lab Analysis: see PECKSOIL

Mo./Yr.                      3/87

Amendments: none

Fertilizer: none except w/ irrig.  
return water

## IRRIGATION WATER

Quarter                      3/87

Lab Analysis: 1/2 water from evap.  
ponds

## Amount &amp;

Frequency: 2 acft for past year

## WATER TABLE

Water Table Depth (feet):

23-Sep-85	03-Oct-85	21-Nov-85	19-Dec-85		10-Feb-86	24-Mar-86				
Sep-85	Oct-85	Nov-85	Dec-85	Jan-86	Feb-86	Mar-86	Apr-86	May-86	Jun-86	
2.08	1.83	1.83	2.75		3.58	2.33				
29-Oct-86	30-Dec-86	26-Feb-87	14-Apr-87	27-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87				
Oct-86	Dec-86	Feb-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87				
3.67	3	2	3.42	3.33	6.25	6.33				



Lab Analysis:

Electric Conductivity (Ec) of Water Table

23-Sep-85	03-Oct-85	21-Nov-85	19-Dec-85		10-Feb-86	24-Mar-86			
Sep-85	Oct-85	Nov-85	Dec-85	Jan-86	Feb-86	Mar-86	Apr-86	May-86	Jun-86
6.4	5.8	6.7	6.4		4.2	4.2			
29-Oct-86	30-Dec-86	26-Feb-87	14-Apr-87	27-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87			
Oct-86	Dec-86	Feb-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87			
4.5	4.2	7.8	7.8	8.4	7.70	7.21			

TREES

Growth:	Quarter	3/87	
Tree	AVE. HT.	AVE. DBH	
casuarina	7'8"	1.0"	
eucalyptus	5'6"	0.9"	


Lab Analysis:

wood	-
leaves	-

WEEDS	Quarter	3/87
		heave comp., morning glory, sunflower, lambs- quarter, ragweed, cockle- bur. Reduced tree growth


# WATER TABLE DEPTH

PECK RANCH



# EC OF GROUND WATER

PECK RANCH



PECK RANCH

disk: AGROFORESTRY DATA II

file: PECKSOIL

last update: 9/4/87

## SOIL DATA

## Before Planting

Inductively Coupled Plasma Spectrophotometry  
micrograms/milliliter

## SAMPLE

NUMBER	Al	As	B	Cd	Cr	Cu	Fe	Hg	Mn	Mo
87P472	1.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.4	0.0	0.1	0.0

## SAMPLE

NUMBER	Pb	Se	Si	Zn
	0.0	0.0	17.7	0.1

1/24/86

SAMPLE NUMBER	DEPTH inches	TEXTURE	DEFICIT MOISTURE	ESP	ECe
PA0	0	C	0.8	4.5	6.2
PA1	12	C	0.2	1.5	5.0
PA2	24	C	0.2	1.5	3.7
PA3	36	C	0.2	1.5	3.8
PB0	0				6.7
PB1	12				4.7
PB2	24				3.5
PB3	36				3.7

	DEPTH inches	ESP	EC X 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALICUOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca+Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR
4/8/86									
PA0	0	4.5	6.2	72	2	5.2	52	20	4
PA1	12	1.5	5.0	56	2	4.5	45	11	2
PA2	24	1.5	3.7	41	2	3.4	34	7	2
PA3	36	1.5	3.8	43	2	3.5	35	8	2
PB1	0	3	6.7	79	2	6.1	61	18	3
PB2	12	4.5	4.7	53	2	3.7	37	16	4
PB3	24	1.5	3.5	38	2	3.0	30	8	2
	36	0.5	3.7	41	2	3.8	38	3	0.5

NOTE: 4/8/86 results appear the same as in 1/24/86,  
thus second date may be incorrect

Rough data is with Murrietta file

## MAY, 1986 REPORT

DEPTH inches	15 BAR pct of <2mm	Ca MEQ/L	Mg MEQ/L	Na MEQ/L	K MEQ/L	Cl MEQ/L	SO4 MEQ/L	NO3 MEQ/L	TOTAL SALTS pct	EC mmhos/cm
#013										
0-5.91	18.4	32.5	6.9	9	0.7	11.5	35	2.2	0.2	4.17
5.91-23.64	21.4	30	6.6	12.6	0.4	10.8	35	2.2	0.2	4.03
23.64-47.28	20.8	23.2	4.1	22.5	0.2	7.2	39.3	0.3	0.2	1.71
#014										
0-5.91	18.4	19.2	4.6	6.1	0.5	3.8	18.9	5.3	0.1	2.61
5.91-23.64	19.9	16.3	4.4	5.8	0.3	4.2	17.1	3.8	0.1	2.35
23.64-47.28	19.5	27.3	6	12.5	0.3	5.2	39.9	1.4	0.2	3.65

## PECKSOIL (continued)

DEPTH inches	15 BAR pct of <2mm	Ca MEQ/L	Mg MEQ/L	Na MEQ/L	K MEQ/L	Cl MEQ/L	SO4 MEQ/L	NO3 MEQ/L	SALTS pct	EC mmhos/cm
-----										
#015										
0-5.91	19.8	18.6	3.7	6.9	0.6	4.1	12	10.1	0.1	2.65
5.91-23.64	21.9	14.2	3	7.9	0.3	4.2	16	3.3	0.1	2.29
23.64-47.28	19.5	27.4	4.6	19.5	0.3	5.8	41.6	unclear	0.2	3.99
#016										
0-5.91	20.5	42.7	9.2	20.9	0.8	18.9	32.4	18.1	0.4	6.04
5.91-23.64	22.3	29.5	6.7	14.5	0.4	11.1	30.3	5.6	0.3	4.13
23.64-47.28	21.3	25.7	3.9	16.9	0.2	2.8	39.3	1.2	0.2	3.54
#017										
0-5.91	18.6	29.3	6.7	14.1	0.7	8.6	34.1	3.9	0.2	3.89
5.91-23.64	21.2	30.3	7.6	15.4	0.3	10.5	35.3	3.8	0.3	4.25
23.64-47.28	21.8	28.1	5.1	14.4	0.2	5	38.9	2.6	0.2	3.61
#018										
0-5.91	21.3	34.2	7.8	12.7	0.7	12.1	28.8	10.4	0.3	4.5
5.91-23.64	23.4	29	6.6	10.9	0.5	8.6	30.7	4.2	0.2	3.73
23.64-47.28	23.7	27.6	4.9	9.9	0.4	5.2	32.3	2.6	0.2	3.29
#019										
0-5.91	21.7	27.9	5.7	31.7	0.6	10.7	45.1	6.3	0.3	5.33
5.91-23.64	22.2	28.3	5.5	20.5	0.5	8.8	39.7	3.3	0.3	4.33
23.64-47.28	24.2	27	4.8	23.6	0.3	6.4	46.7	1.6	0.3	4.36
#020										
0-5.91	24.2	38.1	8.7	20.6	0.8	23.2	33.2	9.1	0.3	5.52
5.91-23.64	24.5	22.1	5.1	11.3	0.5	8.3	26.1	1	0.2	3.14
23.64-47.28	23.7	29.4	5.7	16.5	0.3	9.9	39	---	0.3	3.99
#021										
0-5.91	23.4	8.2	2	5.4	0.4	1.6	10.6	---	0.1	1.43
5.91-23.64	22.7	5.4	1.5	4.7	0.2	1.5	7.8	---	0.1	1.21
23.64-47.28	21.2	17.4	3.3	17	0.3	3	35.6	---	0.2	3.21
#022										
0-5.91	21.6	34.5	7.9	10.9	0.9	16	27	12.2	0.3	4.67
5.91-23.64	25.3	31.1	7.1	9.8	0.6	12.5	30.1	5.3	0.2	3.83
23.64-47.28	23.2	14.4	2.9	8.5	0.3	4	21.2	0.8	0.1	2.38
#023										
0-5.91	16.8	2.7	0.6	4.4	0.4	2.5	1.7	1.3	TR	0.89
5.91-23.64	16.6	37.9	6.2	6.3	0.4	43.3	37.1	24.5	0.5	9.74
23.64-47.28	22	25.5	4.1	118.1	0.4	36.8	96	18.4	0.9	12.57
#024										
0-5.91	14.2	26.5	7.8	8.9	1.1	1.1	39.5	---	0.1	3.29
5.91-23.64	15.8	25.3	5.2	41.5	0.7	13.6	44.5	12.2	0.3	6.37
23.64-47.28	21.2	21.5	3.5	111.2	0.3	29.6	94.8	14.4	0.7	11.94

#### 4.3 Thomsen Brothers

The Thomsen Brothers farm was planted with 8,700 *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* (Lake Albacutya seed source) and 475 *Casuarina cunninghamiana* in May of 1986. Three additional acres of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* (Lake Albacutya) were planted in June of 1987. October 1987 plantings include 3 acres of *E. camaldulensis*, planted in a high water table area which was previously drained into the San Luis Drain (and to Kesterson Reservoir), and a 2 acre extension of the first planting of 1986. The rows of trees on this plantation run nearly 1/2 mile in length and should help reduce soil erosion in adjacent fields by providing a wind-break. The trees have been staked to prevent the trunks from bending due to the strong winds in the area. Young *casuarina* have been found to be more resistant to wind stress than the young *eucalyptus*, possibly because of their slender, needle-like leaves which allow the wind to pass.


The trees on the Thomsen Brothers farm appear to be growing quite well and some trees are reaching heights of 14 to 16 feet in one year. The seedlings received good quality Westlands water last year and are using ground water supplemented with drainage water from the adjacent sump this year. Weeds have been adequately controlled both with chemical sprays and by hand. No fertilizer or soil amendments have been added. Some trees appear to be slightly damaged by the drift of herbicides.

The USDA-SCS in Fresno took bimonthly and later monthly measurements of water table depth and EC until last August, when CSUF students began biweekly monitoring. Soil and water samples have been (and in the future will be) sent to Dellavalle Labs for analysis. The results of the first analyses are included with the following farm report.

This farm is also under observation as part of the wildlife study and outstanding trees will be utilized next year for the UCD selection and propagation project.

# THOMSEN BROTHERS AGROFORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PLANTINGS

3 Locations



## AGROFORESTAGROFORESTRY PLANTINGS

disc: AGROFORESTRY

file: AGFOTHOM

last update: 10/17/87

county: FRESNO

farm: THOMSEN

acreage:

15

av.tr/ac:

1192

## PLANTINGS

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	17400	0	0	475	0	0	0	17875
5/30,6?/86	CDF	L.ALBACUT	8700							
5/30,6?/86	CDF	AUSTRALIA				475				
6/15/87	SJF	L.ALBACUTYA	3000							
10/87	SJF	L.ALBACUTYA	4200 ?#							
10/87	CDF	L.ALBACUTYA	1500							

	Mo./Yr.	3/87	9/87	10/87
Comments:		look very good, staked trees 1st planting 7 acres	Trees planted 6/15 in 6 rows, 1/2 mile long, 6.5'X5.5', 3 acres, next to sump, 1 mi. S and 1/2 mi. E of 1st planting	3 ac spaced 6.5X5' in hi water table area, had been tiled to SL drain, next to sump, 2 ac extends 1st plan- ting to 1/2 mi, spacing 6.5'X 5.5' by San Diego Ave.

SOIL	Mo./Yr.	3/87	7/87
Lab Analysis:		-	see THOMSOIL

Amendments: none

Fertilizer: none

## IRRIGATION WATER

	Mo./Yr.	3/87
Lab Analysis:		good quality Westlands 1st year, sump water this year

Amount & Frequency:	total this past year = 1.5 ac ft
------------------------	-------------------------------------

## WATER TABLE

Depth (feet):

	29-Oct-86	30-Dec-86	26-Feb-87	20-Apr-87	27-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87
	Oct-86	Nov-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87
NORTH END	5.67	6.5	5.83	4.33	4.00	5.33	7
SOUTH END	5.08	6.67	7.67	4.42	3.33	5.25	6.58

Lab Analysis:

Electric Conductivity (Ec) of ground water

	29-Oct-86				26-Feb-87		20-Apr-87	27-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87
	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87
NORTH END	6.5				6.9		7.5	7.8	8.08	7.52
SOUTH END	6.5				7.7		7.4	7.3	7.67	7.66

also see THOMWATR

TREES Mo./Yr. 3/87

Growth: -

Lab Analysis:

wood -

leaves -


WEEDS Mo./Yr. 3/87

chemical sprays & hand  
weeding adequate




# WATER TABLE DEPTH

THOMPSON BROTHERS



# EC OF GROUND WATER

THOMPSON BROTHERS



Thompson Ranch

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: THOMWATR

last update: 9/4/87

# WATER DATA

DATE	SAMPLE	DEPTH feet	EC
10-29-86	North End	5.67	6.5
	South End	5.08	6.5
12-30-86	North End	6.5	
	South End	6.67	
2-26-87	North End	5.83	6.9
	South End	7.67	7.7
4-20-87	North End	4.33	7.5
	South End	4.42	7.4
5-27-87	North End	4.00	7.8
	South End	3.33	7.3
6-23-87	North End	5.33	8.08
	South End	5.25	7.67
7-20-87	North End	7	7.52
	South End	6.58	7.66

5/4/87

Dellavalle Labs

Undigested Sample

EC	Ca	Mg	Na	SAR	SAR	Cl	CO3+HCO3	SO4-S	B
dS/m	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l		adj	Meq/l	Meq/l	mg/l	mg/l
7.16	32.7	22	46.0	8.8	27.1	15.4	8.7	1000	6.8
NO3-N	Fe	Mn	Li	F	pH				
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l					
54.6	<0.1	<0.05	0.3	0.16	7.5				

Digested Sample

P	K	Zn	Mn	Na	Fe	Cu	Ca	Mg	Be
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
2.8	9.9	4.1	1.6	955	28.6	3.9	807	334	<0.025
V	Pb	Cr	Cd	As	Hg	Se	Mo	Al	Si
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
<0.8	0.3	0.27	<0.025	7	<0.2	32	0.4	16.5	29.0

THOMPSON RANCH

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: THOMSOIL

last update: 9/4/87

SOIL DATA

Dellavalle Labs

5/5/87

-----Undigested-----											
SP	pHs	ECe	Ca	Mg	Na	Cl	ESP	B	NO3-N	PO4-P	K (AA)
		dS/m	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l		mg/l	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg
39	7.5	6.0	37	16	24	17.2	5.3	2.4	88	16	320

-----Undigested-----				
Zn	Mn	Fe	Cu	SO4-S
mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg
0.7	9.1	9.4	1.1	310

-----DTPA Extract-----				-----Saturated Paste Extract-----						
Ni	Pb	Cr	Cd	Hg	As	Se	NO3-N	PO4-P	K	SO4-S
mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
1.4	0.6	<0.25	0.05	<0.2	17	76	225	<0.1	68	710


#### 4.4 Carollo

Sal Carollo planted 7 acres of his farm with *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* (various seed sources) and various *casuarina* species in May and June of 1986. This year he added about 3 acres of eucalyptus and one row of *Elderica* pine (*Pinus elderica*). This plantation clearly shows the differences between planting on good and poor quality soil. The variation in growth characteristics is dramatically evident, with a sudden change from the area of lush growth to that with stunted trees. At 3 to 4 months of age (October 1986), the largest trees stood 6 to 7 feet tall, while seedlings planted in the highest sodium areas showed very little growth (7 to 12 inches tall) and poor color. Gypsum was applied to two rows of these trees, and the response was evident almost immediately, with the leaf yellowing gone in two weeks and the trees outgrowing the untreated, sodium affected plants in two months. Gypsum was later applied to the entire eucalyptus planting.

This plantation has also received 2 applications of fertilizer. Weeds have been kept under control with Round-up and Fusilade. The seedlings received good quality irrigation water for the first year. This year irrigation frequency has been reduced because the trees seem to be utilizing ground water. No weeding has been necessary this year for the 1986 plantings.

The USDA-SCS in Hanford has monitored the water table depth and EC and has run several analyses of soil and ground water. Samples have also been sent to Dellavalle Labs. These data are included in the following farm report. In 1988 cuttings from superior trees will be taken for the selection and propagation project.

# SAL CAROLLO AGROFORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PLANTINGS



## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY

file: AGFOCARO

last update: 10/23/87

county: KINGS

farm: CAROLLO acreage: 10 av.tr/ac: 1641

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	ELDER. PINE	gr.tot.
		total:	15710	100	0	600	0	0	100	16410
5/1/86	SJN	L.ALBACUT	5750							
5/?/86	SJN(replant)	MT BERNSTEAD	(700)							
	*	1 row Alice Springs								
5/27/86	SJN	L.ALBACUT	6000							
6/2/86	CORNFL	AUSTRALIA				600				
86	CDF(replant)	L.ALBACUTYA	(2000)							
6/2/87	SJN	L.ALBACUTYA	3960							
6/2/87	Foote	STRATFORD		100						
6/2/87	CDF	Elderica Pine							100	
7/20/87	SJF(replant)	MT BERNSTEAD	(700)							

\* unclear info

Comments:	begin 86	end 86	3/87	9/87
Mo./Yr.	irrig. 2 days after planting, lost 10%. 2nd planting in moist soil, <4% loss	Alice Spr. & Mt Bern. doing better than (Al-bacut.), but larger leaves may catch wind, defoliant damage South side, phos. gyp. plot better color & growth	doing well except in Na effected soils, Cas all growing well	New plantings on 3 ac, 5.5'X 6', replant 30% need to check info on replants, death prob. due to hi SAR, hi Na

## SOILS

Mo./Yr.	86	3/87	5/87	7/87
Lab Analysis:	with Na, no Ca+Mg, Ec 4.0 mmhos/cm, 2560 ppm	see CAROSOIL	see CAROSOIL	see CAROSOIL
Amendments:		gypsum around trees in 2 rows, leaf yellowing gone in 2 weeks, out-growing others in 2 months	20 T 90% gypsum on Eucalyptus only (5 tons/ac in 2/87)	
Fertilizer:		2 applications, 15 un. N and 17 units N (50 & 70?)	none this quarter	

## IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:

Date	Ec X 1000	ppm TDS	amount (ac. ft.)
25-Mar-87	0.04	25	1.2
29-Apr-87	0.04	25	1

Mo./Yr.	86	3/87	5/87
Amount & Frequency:	5/14, 5/28, 6/15, 7/14, 7/27, 8/1, 8/19, 9/11, 9/30. Total 9 Xs, ave. 1 acft/irrig. (7 ac)	-	see above

# WATER TABLES

Water Table Depths (feet)(3/86 - 10/86 from carowatr):

WELL #	13-Mar-86		12-May-86		21-Jul-86		26-Sep-86	13-Oct-86		
	Mar-86	Apr-86	May-86	Jun-86	Jul-86	Aug-86	Sep-86	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86
1	5		4.1		3.1		5.0	5.5		
2			4.1		3.5		4.4	5.8		
3			4.1		3.2		5.6	5.6		
4					2.8		5.0	5.3		
5					2.4		5.0	5		
6					2.3		4.8	4.8		
					3 days aft. irrigation canal running			7 days aft. irrigation canal dry		

WELL #						25-Jun-87		12-Aug-87		
	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87	Aug-87		
1					4.5	3.6		3.1		
2					5	4.0		3.8		
3					4.5	3.6		3.7		
4					4.5	3.5		3.0		
5					4.2	2.8		2.5		
6					4	2.8		2.5		

Lab Analysis: also see CAROWATR

Electric Conductivity of Ground Water (Ec X 1000) (from carowatr)

WELL #	13-Mar-86		12-May-86		21-Jul-86		15-Sep-86	13-Oct-86		
	Mar-86	Apr-86	May-86	Jun-86	Jul-86	Aug-86	Sep-86	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86
1	0.53		1.42		0.76			0.73		
2			0.52		0.97			0.21		
3			0.51		0.65			0.64		
4					0.64			0.63		
5					0.61			0.8		
6					0.23			0.66		

WELL #						25-Jun-87		12-Aug-87		
	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87	Aug-87		
						0.6		0.5		
1						0.5		0.4		
2						0.5		0.4		
3						0.5		0.6		
4						1.6		1.1		
5						0.2		0.3		
6										

## TREES

Growth:

Mo./Yr.	10/86	12/86	3/87	5/87
	largest trees 6'-7', in hi SAR & ESP areas 7"-12" tall	See CAROGROW	2.72 ft ave. growth 9% died (91% survival)	excellent in better soils, trees respond to gypsum

Lab Analysis:

wood	-	-
Leaves	-	-

WEEDS

Quarter

3/87

5/87

satisfactory control

Fusilade to Euc. & Cas.

Round-up on Johnson

on 5-20-87

grass, some tree damage



SAL CAROLLO

disc: AGROFORESTRY II file: CAROWATR

last update: 9/3/87

## WATER DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH feet	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALICUOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	REMARKS
3/31/86	1	5		.53	5.3	2	0.4	4.0	1.3	(18)	(20)	(?) data on records unclear
5/12/86	1	4.1		1.42	14.2	2	0.2	2.0	12.2	12.2	12.5	Perched water tables
	2	4.1		.52	5.2	2	0.2	2.0	3.2	3.2	3.6	Perched water tables
	3	4.1		.51	5.1	2	0.2	2.0	3.1	3.1	3.5	Perched water tables
7/21/86	1	3.1		.76	7.6		2.0					
	2	3.5		.97	9.7		3.0					
	3	3.2		.65	6.5		1.0					
	4	2.8		.64	6.4		2.0					
	5	2.4		.61	6.1		2.0					
	6	2.3		.23	2.3		1.0					
9/26/86	1	5.0										
	2	4.4										
	3	5.6										
	4	5.0										
	5	5.0										
	6	4.8										
10/13/86	1	5.5	8.1	.73	7.3			2.0	5.3	5.3	5.7	
	2	5.8	8.2	.21	2.1			1.0	1.1	1.5	1.7	
	3	5.6	8.6	.64	6.4			2.0	4.4	4.4	4.8	
	4	5.3	8.4	.63	6.3			2.0	4.3	4.3	4.7	
	5	5.0	8.1	.80	8.0			2.5	5.5	4.4	4.9	
	6	4.8	8.0	.66	6.6			2.2	4.4	4.1	4.3	
5/87	1	4.5										
	2	5										
	3	4.5										
	4	4.5										
	5	4.2										
	6	4										
6/25/87	1	3.6			0.6							
	2	4.0			0.5							
	3	3.6			0.5							
	4	3.5			0.5							
	5	2.8			1.6							
	6	2.8			0.2							

## CAROWATR (continued)

DATE	WELL #	DEPTH feet	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	REMARKS
8-12-87	1	3.1		0.5								
	2	3.8		0.4								
	3	3.7		0.4								
	4	3.0		0.6								
	5	2.5		1.1								
	6	2.5		0.3								

5/4/87

Dellavalle Labs

Undigested Sample

EC	Ca	Mg	Na	SAR	SAR	Cl	CO <sub>3</sub> +HCO <sub>3</sub>	SO <sub>4</sub> -S	B	NO <sub>3</sub> -N
dS/m	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l		adj	Meq/l	Meq/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
0.52	2.1	2.2	1.5	1.0	2.2	0.2	4.9	4	0.2	0.8

Fe	Mn	Li	F	pH
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	
<0.1	<0.05	<0.04	1.7	7.5

Digested Sample

P	K	Zn	Mn	Na	Fe	Cu	Ca	Mg	Be	V
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
0.2	0.9	0.1	0.07	34.9	1.3	0.1	25.9	26.1	<0.025	<0.8

Pb	Cr	Cd	As	Hg	Se	Mo	Al	Si
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
<0.1	<0.25	<0.025	26	<0.2	<2	<0.1	1.0	31.3

SAL CAROLLO

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: CAROSOIL

last update: 9/3/87

## SOIL DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH inches	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	REMARKS
2/18/86	2	0 - 12		4.7	53	2	.3	3.0	50	41	38	
		3 - 18		3.2	35	2	.4	4.0	31	22	23	
	3A	6 - 24		6.8	80	2	1.0	10.0	70	31	31	
	3B	24 - 36		2.8	30	2	.4	4.0	26	(18)	(20)	(?) data on records unclear
3/31/86	1	0 - 10		4.6	52		.2	2.0	50	50	52	
	2	10 - 20		2.10	22		.2	2.0	20	20	21	
	3	20 - 30		0.59	5.9		.2	5.7	57	34	36	
	4	30 - 40		0.76	7.6		.4	4.0	7.2	5.0	5.2	
	5	40 - 50		0.51	5.1		.2	2.2	4.9	4.67	5.05	
7/2/86		0 - 12		3.5	38		.1	1.0	37	52	53	Trees have died twice
7/21/86		0 - 12	8.6	7.5	85		.2	2.0	83	83	84	Before gyp
7/28/86	1	0 - 12	8.4	2.45	27		.2	2.0	25	25	26	Large tree 4' tall
	2	0 - 6	9.2	9.60	118		.1	1.0	117	167	169	Trees planted 2xs & died
	3	6 - 12	9.5	9.30	113		.1	1.0	112	160	163	Trees planted 2xs & died
10/13/86		0 - 12	9.0	6.7	80		.6	6.0	74	42	45	After gyp
10/13/86	1	0 - 12	9.1	1.56	15.6		.3	3.0	12.6	10	12	Large tree 7' tall
	2	0 - 12	8.9	2.1	22		2.2	22	0	0	0	Alice Springs 3' tall
	3	12 - 24	8.0	3.8	43		.3	3.0	40	32	33	Alice Springs 3' tall
	4	0 - 12	9.3	8.6	105		.1	1.0	104	147	150	No gyp, trees died twice
4/87	live trees	0 - 12	9.2	4.2	47		0.2	2.0	45	45		just staying alive
	dead trees	0 - 12	9.3	8.1	96		0.3	3.0	93	76		
DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH inches	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	REMARKS
6/22/87	E. side	0 - 12	8.8	5.6	64	2	0.5	5	59	38		1 yr old, avg w' in 4/87
	W. side	0 - 12	8.3	1.1	11	2	0	<1	10.9	750		
8/87	new plant.	0 - 12	8.4	6.5	78		0.6	6.0	72	41		New euc planting
		12 - 24	8.8	3.8	43		0.2	2.0	41	41		
		24 - 36	8.3	1.94	19		0.4	4.0	15	11		
		36 - 48	7.9	0.83	8.3		0.6	6.0	2.3	1		

## CAROSOIL (continued)

Dellavalle Labs

5/5/87

-----Undigested-----										
SP	pHs	ECe	Ca	Mg	Na	Cl	ESP	B	NO3-N	PO4-P
		dS/m	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l		mg/l	mg/kg	mg/kg
54	8.8	6.8	2.3	2.0	57	9.8	36	3.4	29	4
-----Undigested-----										
K (AA)	Zn	Mn	Fe	Cu	SO4-S					
mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg					
111	0.3	2.0	14.0	1.0	190					
-----DTPA Extract-----						-----Saturated Paste Extract-----				
Ni	Pb	Cr	Cd	Hg	As	Se	NO3-N	PO4-P	K	SO4-S
mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
0.4	0.6	<0.25	<0.025	14.0	149	16	28	10	4	820

Sal Carollo

disk: AGROFORESTRY II file: CAROGROW

last update: 9/24/87

TREE GROWTH DATA

Dec 31, 1986

EUCALYPTUS (rows 1 through 88)

Planting date: May, 1986

ROW 10 FROM S (W-E)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	4.6	0.05	20	2.7		39	0		58	3.2		77	6.1	0.35
2	2.4		21	3.2		40	0		59	3.0		78	8.2	0.60
3	2.8		22	4		41	0.3		60	2.7		79	7.6	0.60
4	1.4		23	4.6	0.05	42	0.5		61	2.8		80	6.9	0.50
5	2.6		24	3.6		43	0.5		62	3.6		81	8.0	0.65
6	2.9		25	4.8	0.10	44	0		63	3.7		82	7.7	0.60
7	3.7		26	3.4		45	0		64	4.8	0.05	83	6.5	0.30
8	4.5		27	4.9	0.05	46	0.7		65	4.2		84	7.2	0.55
9	3.6		28	2.7		47	1.1		66	4.5		85	8.2	0.65
10	4.3		29	2.9		48	0.5		67	5.0	0.15	86	5.0	0.10
11	4.2		30	2.0		49	0		68	5.0	0.15	87	2.8	1.00
12	4.8	0.10	31	2.1		50	1.0		69	0		88	0	
13	3.8		32	1.0		51	0.8		70	0		89	1.2	
14	4.8		33	0.6		52	1.5		71	6.1	0.35	90	6.4	0.25
15	3.8		34	0		53	1.4		72	6.5	0.35	91	7.1	0.35
16	2.8		35	0.5		54	1.7		73	7.0	0.60	92	4.5	
17	2.8		36	0.5		55	2.1		74	9.0	0.70			
18	2.5		37	0		56	0		75	7.6	0.50			
19	2.1		38	0		57	2.2		76	7.0	0.60			
subtot	64.4	0.2	43.5	0.2		14.3	0.0		85.7	3.5		93.4	6.5	
# of DBH data		2		3			0			9			13	

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 10 = 3.8      AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 10 = 0.381      No. dead trees = 12.0

## ROW 20 FROM S (E-W) (gypsum row)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	7.7	0.45	21	2.5		41	1.3		61	1.0		81	0	
2	7.2	0.40	22	3.3		42	1.2		62	0		82	1.7	
3	7.8	0.50	23	2.3		43	1.7		63	0.9		83	1.0	
4	7.4	0.40	24	1		44	1.0		64	1.4		84	3.7	
5	5.1	0.10	25	3.4		45	0.7		65	0.8		85	0	
6	8.2	0.60	26	2.1		46	0		66	0.9		86	0.7	
7	8.5	0.60	27	3.1		47	0.8		67	1.6		87	2.4	
8	8.2	0.55	28	6.0	0.15	48	1.2		68	1.6		88	4.5	
9	6.5	0.45	29	3.8		49	0.9		69	0		89	3.2	
10	3.7		30	2.1		50	0		70	1.4		90	3.1	
11	7.0	0.50	31	3.5		51	0		71	1.6		91	1.5	
12	7.3	0.40	32	3.1		52	0.9		72	1.0		92	2.0	
13	6.8	0.40	33	3.3		53	0.8		73	1.6		93	2.1	
14	7.1	0.45	34	2.2		54	1.2		74	1.2		94	2.3	
15	7.3	0.45	35	3.0		55	1.1		75	2.1		95	3.4	
16	6.0	0.25	36	1.2		56	0		76	1.8		96	2.9	
17	6.0	0.20	37	1.0		57	1.4		77	1.5		97	2.5	
18	6.5	0.20	38	2.4		58	0		78	2.2		98	3.0	
19	5.3	0.15	39	?		59	0.7		79	?				
20	2.2		40	?		60	0.7		80	?				

subtot	131.8	7.05	49.3	0.15	15.6	0	22.6	0	40	0
# of DBH data	18		1		0		0		0	0

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 20 = 2.91      AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 20 = 0.379      No. dead trees = 9.0

## ROW 40 FROM SOUTH SIDE (W-E)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	1.0		26	2.0		51	2.9		76	6.2	0.25	101	2.2	
2	1.4		27	1.7		52	2.2		77	7.9	0.45	102	4.5	
3	0.5		28	2.5		53	4.5		78	6.3	0.30	103	5.3	0.15
4	1.1		29	4.1		54	3.0		79	7.2	0.50	104	5.1	0.15
5	1.4		30	4.5		55	3.3		80	5.6	0.20	105	5.2	0.20
6	1.7		31	3.7		56	3.8		81	5.5	0.15	106	5.3	0.15
7	2.4		32	2.6		57	3.9		82	5.4	0.20	107	5.6	0.25
8	3.0		33	3.1		58	4.3		83	6.5	0.35	108	1.0	
9	2.0		34	2.9		59	1.6		84	7.7	0.40	109	5.2	0.15
10	2.9		35	3.0		60	4.5		85	6.8	0.40	110	6.2	0.30
11	1.9		36	3.3		61	4.0		86	5.7	0.25	111	7.4	0.40
12	3.1		37	4.0		62	3.6		87	7.0	0.55	112	6.7	0.35
13	1.2		38	3.5		63	3.7		88	4.5		113	4.4	
14	1.0		39	3.7		64	4.3		89	5.2	0.20	114	5.1	0.10
15	0.7		40	4.1		65	2.4		90	8.2	0.70	115	6.0	0.15
16	0.2		41	4.3		66	4.4		91	7.0	0.35	116	4.5	
17	0.3		42	3.8		67	7.0	0.40	92	6.8	0.30	117	3.5	
18	2.5		43	2.7		68	5.4	0.20	93	5.0	0.10	118	2.1	
19	0.7		44	4.6	0.05	69	6.1	0.20	94	9.1	0.60	119	4.7	0.10
20	0.6		45	3.3		70	2.4		95	7.7	0.50	120	5.5	0.20
21	0.6		46	4.2		71	2.6		96	7.3	0.40	121		
22	1.9		47	3.0		72	7.0	0.30	97	7.8	0.50	122		
23	1.6		48	4.2		73	7.1	0.60	98	6.3	0.30	123		
24	2.0		49	3.0		74	6.1	0.20	99	6.2	0.25	124		
25	2.7		50	3.6		75	6.2	0.20	100	6.6	0.35	125		
subtot	38.4	0	85.4	0.05		106.3	2.1		165.5	8.55		95.5	2.65	
# of DBH data	0			1			7			24			13	

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 40 = 4.1      AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 40 = 0.297      No. dead trees = 0.0

## CAROGROW (page 4)

## ROW 50 FROM SOUTH (E-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	2.5		20	4.6		39	2.0		58	2.0		77	0	
2	3.7		21	3.6		40	?		59	2.2		78	1.1	
3	2.9		22	2.2		41	2.7		60	2.3		79	1.3	
4	2.0		23	0		42	2.9		61	2.0		80	?	
5	2.2		24	3.3		43	0.9		62	0.9		81	1.7	
6	2.0		25	2.5		44	1.5		63	1.3		82	0.9	
7	2.5		26	1.9		45	2.2		64	1.1		83	2.0	
8	2.1		27	2.0		46	2.0		65	1.0		84	1.6	
9	2.1		28	1.6		47	2.5		66	1.5		85	1.6	
10	2.7		29	2.9		48	1.9		67	1.0		86	2.4	
11	0		30	2.7		49	3.3		68	1.7		87	1.2	
12	2.8		31	2.1		50	2.3		69	1.0		88	0.7	
13	3.9		32	3.7		51	2.0		70	2.2		89	1.7	
14	3.0		33	5.7	0.20	52	4.2		71	1.8		90	1.9	
15	5.1	0.15	34	2.6		53	1.5		72	2.8		91	1.7	
16	2.2		35	3.1		54	1.5		73	3.4		92		
17	4.4		36	3.0		55	1.3		74	1.3		93		
18	3.8		37	0		56	2.5		75	1.4		94		
19	5.0	0.20	38	2.2		57	2.0		76	2.0		95		
subtot	54.9	0.4	49.7	0.2		39.2	0.0		32.9	0.0		19.8	0.0	
# of DBH data		2		1			0			0			0	
AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 50 =			2.3	AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 50 =			0.18	No. dead trees =			4.0			

## ROW 60 from SOUTH (W-E)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	2.3		16	2.0		31	2.5		46	2.0		61	1.3	
2	0.7		17	1.8		32	1.6		47	2.0		62	2.7	
3	3.0		18	2.4		33	0.8		48	3.0		63	7.2	0.50
4	1.8		19	2.3		34	2.0		49	2.7		64	3.3	
5	2.2		20	1.0		35	2.5		50	2.2		65	2.9	
6	1.8		21	1.2		36	2.9		51	3.1		66	5.0	0.15
7	1.7		22	0.6		37	1.5		52	4.4		67	5.6	0.20
8	3.1		23	1.0		38	1.0		53	6.4	0.25	68	6.1	0.20
9	3.5		24	1.0		39	2.6		54	7.0	0.55	69	4.4	
10	1.1		25	1.0		40	?		55	6.1	0.35	70	2.7	
11	1.4		26	1.0		41	2.5		56	3.5		71		
12	1.8		27	0.8		42	2.3		57	0		72		
13	2.4		28	2.0		43	3.2		58	6.0	0.30	73		
14	2.5		29	2.0		44	2.6		59	2.7		74		
15	1.9		30	2.1		45	2.2		60	2.0		75		
subtot	31.2	0.00	22.2	0.00		30.2	0.00		53.1	1.45		41.2	1.05	
# of DBH data		0		0			0			4.00			4	
AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 60 =			2.6	AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 60 =			0.31	No. dead trees =			1			



CAROGROW (page 5)

ROW 70 from SOUTH (E-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	4.0		14	D		27	1.4		40	?		53	3.5	
2	2.6		15	4.1		28	4.6		41	6.4	0.30	54	4.6	
3	1.4		16	D		29	4.5		42	5.8	0.30	55	0.9	
4	D		17	2.4		30	2.0		43	5.7	0.20	56	1.2	
5	D		18	1.3		31	4.7	0.05	44	5.0	0.10	57		
6	D		19	2.2		32	3.6		45	3.6		58		
7	2.0		20	3.2		33	2.4		46	6.3	0.20	59		
8	D		21	5.2	0.2	34	6.7	0.25	47	5.3	0.20	60		
9	D		22	4.7	0.05	35	4.4		48	2.2		61		
10	1.0		23	6.7	0.4	36	6.4	0.25	49	3.9		62		
11	1.1		24	2.0		37	3.6		50	3.6		63		
12	4.4		25	5.7	0.15	38	7.2	0.3	51	3.3		64		
13	4.0		26	6.9	0.3	39	5.0		52	4.6		65		

subtot 20.5 0.0 44.4 1.1 56.5 0.9 55.7 1.3 10.2 0.0  
 # of DBH data 0 5 4 6 0  
 AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 70 = 3.8 AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 70 = 0.22 No. dead trees = 7

ROW 88 FROM SOUTH (W-E)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	0.6		9	3.7		17	2.3		25	3.7		33		
2	2.0		10	3.9		18	3.2		26	3.2		34		
3	2.3		11	2.5		19	3.4		27	2.3		35		
4	2.4		12	1.8		20	2.0		28	3.2		36		
5	2.9		13	3.2		21	3.6		29	2.1		37		
6	2.7		14	3.0		22	3.1		30	1.3		38		
7	3.3		15	3.1		23	2.2		31			39		
8	1.6		16	2.3		24	3.9		32			40		

subtot 17.8 0.00 23.5 0.00 23.7 0.00 15.8 0.00 0.0 0.0  
 # of DBH data 0 0 0 0 0  
 AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 88 = 2.7 AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 88 = ERR No. dead trees = 0

CASUARINA (rows 89 through 116)

Planting date: June, 1986

ROW 90 FROM SOUTH (E-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	4.4		9	2.7		17	2.3		25	2.6		33		
2	2.6		10	3.6		18	1.0		26	2.7		34		
3	3.9		11	3.8		19	2.6		27	2.0		35		
4	3.0		12	3.0		20	3.5		28	3.2		36		
5	3.0		13	2.5		21	2.7		29	3.6		37		
6	3.2		14	2.6		22	3.6		30	3.2		38		
7	2.4		15	3.0		23	3.5		31			39		
8	2.7		16	3.2		24	3.7		32			40		

subtot 25.2 0.00 24.4 0.00 22.9 0.00 17.3 0.00 0.0 0.0  
 # of DBH data 0 0 0 0 0  
 AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 90 = 3.0 AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW = ERR No. dead trees = 0

CAROGROW (page 6)

ROW 91 FROM SOUTH (W-E)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	2.5		9	3.0		17	2.4		25	3.0		33	3.3	
2	3.5		10	2.0		18	2.6		26	3.3		34	3.7	
3	2.4		11	3.1		19	2.6		27	3.0		35		
4	2.6		12	3.0		20	1.9		28	4.5		36		
5	3.1		13	2.9		21	2.4		29	3.2		37		
6	3.0		14	3.0		22	3.0		30	2.8		38		
7	2.7		15	2.2		23	2.5		31	3.0		39		
8	3.7		16	3.0		24	2.7		32	3.5		40		
subtot	23.5	0.00		22.2	0.00		20.1	0.00		26.3	0.00		7.0	0.0
# of DBH data		0			0			0			0			0

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 91 = 2.9 AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW = ERR No. dead trees = 0

ROW 98 FROM SOUTH (E-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	2.4		9	2.3		17	2.6		25	2.2		33		
2	3.3		10	2.4		18	2.9		26	2.0		34		
3	3.0		11	2.5		19	2.9		27			35		
4	2.3		12	3.7		20	2.1		28			36		
5	2.7		13	4.4		21	3.4		29			37		
6	3.3		14	3.4		22	2.6		30			38		
7	2.8		15	3.0		23	3.6		31			39		
8	2.7		16	2.8		24	2.9		32			40		
subtot	22.5	0.00		24.5	0.00		23.0	0.00		4.2	0.00		0.0	0.0
# of DBH data		0			0			0			0			0

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 98 = 2.9 AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW = ERR No. dead trees = 0

ROW 102 FROM SOUTH (W-E)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	2.6		6	2.1		11	2.7		16	3.0		21	2.5	
2	2.5		7	2.3		12	3		17	2.6		22	2.7	
3	2.8		8	2.9		13	2.7		18	2.2		23	3.3	
4	2.5		9	3.1		14	2.8		19	3.5		24		
5	1.9		10	2.3		15	2.7		20	3.4		25		
subtot	12.3	0.00		12.7	0.00		13.9	0.00		14.7	0.00		8.5	0.00
# of DBH data		0			0			0			0			0


AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 102 = 2.7 AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW = ERR No. dead trees = 0

#### 4.5 Verdigaal Brothers

In June and July of 1986, 8 acres on the Verdigaal Brothers farm was planted with 8,800 *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* (Lake Albacutya) and 600 casuarina. Initially, there were high mortality rates and portions of the field had to be replanted. The poor results of the initial planting are thought to have been experienced for two reasons: hot weather (100+ degrees F) and delayed watering at planting time, and highly saline and sodic conditions in portions of the field. Better survival rates were attained with replants which were planted in moist soil and around which the soil had been loosened to allow more water to get to the trees.

The Verdigaal plantation lies above very high water tables, ranging from 3.2 to 5 feet below the ground surface. This may also be contributing to the below average growth rates on this farm. Tree height measurements from 3 typical rows on the plantation showed average heights of about 3 feet at 5 to 6 months of age. The USDA-SCS in Hanford has monitored the water table depth and EC and also has run several detailed analyses of water and soil samples. Samples from this farm have also been sent to Dellavalle Labs for analysis.

# VERDIGAAL BROTHERS AGROFORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PLANTINGS



## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/30/87

file: AGFOVERD

county: KINGS

farm: VERDIGAAL acreage: 8 av.tr/ac: 1175

## PLANTINGS

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	8800	0	0	100	500	0	0	9400

6/4/86 CDF L.ALBACUTYA 8800

6/4/86 CDF AUSTRALIA 100

7/8/86 CORNFL AUSTRALIA 500

7/18/86 replant\* MT BERNSTEAD

6/3/87 SJN(replant)L.ALBACUTYA (3000)

\* Unclear planting data

## Comments:

Mo./Yr.	7/86	3/87	5/87	9/87
	Euc. from CDF not doing as well as others, cas died 2Xs in 1 area. Dug down on replants so that that water > 1 to 2 ft around plant, re-plant after irrig., better survival rate	some trees died back or were damaged by cotton defoliant, Cas. just alive due to Na in soil	New growth looks good other plantings better due to more irrigations	replanted some eucs, (6/87) prob. reason for death - hi SAR due to hi Na

SOILS	Mo./Yr.	2/86	6/86	3/87	5/87	7/87
Lab Analysis:		see VERDSOIL	Ec 15.4 - 4.2 mmhos/cm prior to planting	see VERDSOIL	-	see VEROSOIL

Amendments:	Gypsum applied some years back	none	none
-------------	--------------------------------	------	------

Fertilizer:	none at this time	none	none
-------------	-------------------	------	------

## IRRIGATION WATER

Mo./Yr.	6/86	3/87	5/87
Lab Analysis:	Canal water (used 1st) Ec = 0.04 mmhos/cm irrigation pump water Ec = 3.2 mmhos/cm drainage water Ec = 5.0 - 7.0	2 reports Canal Ec = 0.08 Well Ec = 3.2 & Canal Ec = 0.04 Well & Drain water together Ec = 5.0	none

Amount & Frequency:	86	86	3/87	5/87
	pre-irrig. 5/19. 6/15, 3.2 EC, 6/17 canal 7/7 canal 7/24 canal	8/4 drain, canal 8/18 drain, canal 9/12 canal 9/30 drain	8 times (in 86?)	once this year (3/87)

WATER TABLE

Depths (feet) (7/86 - 10/86 from verdwatr):

WELL #	22-Jul-86	Aug-86	29-Sep-86	08-Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87
1	3.8		4.5	4						
2	4		3.9	4						
3	3.7		3.7	4.4						
4	4.7		5	4.5						
5	4.5		4.9	4.5						
6	3.8		4.4	4.6						

WELL #	27-May-87	25-Jun-87	12-Aug-87
	May-87	Jun-87	Jul-87
1	3.8	4.6	4.8
2	4.8	4.9	4.2
3	4.6	4.4	4.4
4	5.1	4.6	3.2
5	5	3.6	3.5
6	4.7	3.7	3.65

Lab Analysis: also see VERDWATR

Electric Conductivity (Ec X 1000) of ground water (from verdwatr)

WELL #	31-Mar-86	Apr-86	May-86	Jun-86	22-Jul-86	Aug-86	Sep-86	08-Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86
	Mar-86				Jul-86			Oct-86		
1	3.3				2.9			2.5		
2	0.98				1.03			0.93		
3	5				0.93			0.54		
4					8.9			12.1		
5					2.8			4.1		
6					1.98			2.04		

								01-Oct-86		
casuarina								19.2		
eucalyptus								32		

WELL #	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	25-Jun-87	12-Aug-87
						Jun-87	Aug-87
1						1.3	1.5
2						0.4	0.5
3						0.4	0.4
4						5.1	6.6
5						3.4	2.6
6						1.7	1.6

see VERDWATR for more detail

# TREES

Mo./Yr.	12/86	3/87	5/87
Growth:	see VERDGROW	ave. ht. = 2.8 ft 13% mortality, 87% survival	new growth looks good

## Lab Analysis:

wood	-	-
leaves	-	-

# WEEDS

Mo./Yr.	6/86	3/87	5/87
	Fusilade in Eucs but not Cas, 1 treatment killed watergrass & strangletop, burmuda grass showing stress	3 applications Fusilade for Burmuda & Water grass, good results	Fusilade none yet this year

VERDEGAAL BROS.

disc: AGROFORESTRY 11

file: VERDWATR

last update: 8/14/87

WATER DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH feet	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALQUOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	REMARKS
3/31/86	1			3.30	36		1.1	11	25	9	11	
	2			0.98	9.8		0.3	3	9.5	7	9	
	3			5.00	56		3.0	30	26	6	7	
7/22/86	1	3.8		2.9			7.0					
	2	4.0		1.03								
	3	3.7		0.93								
	4	4.7		8.9			20.0					
	5	4.5		2.8								
	6	3.8		1.98								
9/29/86	1	4.5										
	2	3.9										
	3	3.7										
	4	5										
	5	4.9										
	6	4.4										
10/1/86	casuarina		9.1	19.2	248		0.80	8.0	240	120	124	Barely alive
	eucalypt.		9.4	32.0	420		0.90	9.0	411	194	197	Planted 3 times & died 3 times
10/8/86	1	4.0		2.5	27			4.0	23	16	17	
	2	4.0		0.93	9.3			2.0	7.3	7.3	7.9	
	3	4.4		0.54	5.4			1.7	3.7	4	5	
	4	4.5		12.10	150			15.0	135	49	53	
	5	4.5		4.1	47			2.8	44.2	37	41	
	6	4.6		2.04	22			2.0	20	20	23	

5/4/87

Dellavalle Labs

Undigested Sample

EC	Ca	Mg	Na	SAR	SAR	Cl	CO3+HCO3	SO4-S	B	NO3-N	Fe
dS/m	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l		adj	Meq/l	Meq/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
6.56	7.2	8.1	63.6	23.0	68.8	10.8	22.8	690	1.3	4.6	<0.1
Mn	Li	F	pH								
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l									
0.3	<0.04	1.3	7.6								

Digested Sample

P	K	Zn	Mn	Na	Fe	Cu	Ca	Mg	Be	V	Pb
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
1.6	4.4	0.6	0.62	1430	3.6	0.7	118	106	<0.025	<0.8	0.2
Cr	Cd	As	Hg	Se	Mo	Al	Si				
mg/l	mg/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l				
<0.25	<0.025	20	<0.2	<2	0.8	3.3	7.7				



VERDEGAAL BROS.

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: VERDSOIL

last update: 8/31/87

## SOIL DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH inches	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOUT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	TOTAL SALTS meq/l	REMARKS
1/31/86	1	0 - 12		4.2			3.3	33	14	3	3	47	see map
	1	12 - 24		8.9			7.1	71	38	6	7	109	in file
	2	0 - 12		15.4			0.4	4.0	190	134	66	194	for sample
	2	12 - 24		5.9			0.4	4.0	64	45	39	68	locations
	3	0 - 12		5.6			0.4	4.0	60	42	36	64	
	3	12 - 24		8.8			0.7	7.0	101	54	43	108	
3/86	1	0 - 12		7.2			1.0						
	1	12 - 24		3.0			0.60						
	1	24 - 36		2.6			0.40						
	2	0 - 12		5.9			1.0						
	2	12 - 24		1.47			0.20						
	2	24 - 36		1.57			0.20						
	3	0 - 12		11.5			0.50						
	3	12 - 24		15.8			1.0						
	3	24 - 36		9.80			0.30						
3/31/86	V-1	0 - 12		3.30	36		1.1	11	25	9	11		
	V-2	0 - 12		0.98	9.8		0.3	3	9.5	7	9		
	V-3	0 - 12		5.00	56		3.0	30	26	6	7		
7/22/86	V-6	0 - 12	3.9	38	550		26+	260	290	1.49	1.60		Planted twice & died, acid dump area
10/1/86	V-4	0 - 12	9.1	19.2	248		0.80	8.0	240	120	124		Casuarina, just living
	V-5	0 - 12	9.4	32.0	420		0.90	9.0	411	194	197		Eucalyptus, planted 3 times & died 3 times
10/7/86	V-7	0 - 18	7.5	7.5	90		4.5	45	45	9.48	9.70		Trees 3-4'tall, near acid area 10' E
	V-8	0 - 18	8.3	1.97	19		0.3	3	16	13	15		Trees 2-3' tall
10/13/86	V-9	0 - 18	9.2	20.1	270		1.2	12.0	255	104	107		Trees dead, twice
	V-10	0 - 18	9.5	11.9	149		0.2	2.0	147	147	150		Trees dead, twice
	V-11	0 - 12	8.1	12.1	150		2.3	23	127	11	14		Trees alive
	V-12	12 - 24	8.6	0.54	5.4		0.1	1.0	4.4	6	7		

VERDSOIL (continued)

Dellavalle Labs

5/5/87

-----Undigested-----										
SP	pHs	ECe dS/m	Ca Meq/l	Mg Meq/l	Na Meq/l	Cl Meq/l	ESP	B mg/l	NO3-N mg/kg	PO4-P mg/kg
35	9.2	10.1	1.7	1.2	103	20.6	56	3.9	4	20

-----Undigested-----					
K (AA) mg/kg	Zn mg/kg	Mn mg/kg	Fe mg/kg	Cu mg/kg	SO4-S mg/kg
1139	1.1	4.3	6.0	0.4	440

-----DTPA Extract-----				-----Saturated Paste Extract-----						
Ni mg/kg	Pb mg/kg	Cr mg/kg	Cd mg/kg	Hg ug/l	As ug/l	Se ug/l	NO3-N mg/l	PO4-P mg/l	K mg/l	SO4-S mg/l
0.4	0.4	<0.25	<0.025	<0.2	51	14	2	20	369	1500

VERDIGAAL BROTHERS

disk: AGROFORESTRY II file: VERDGROW

last update: 8/31/87

TREE GROWTH DATA

Dec 29, 1986

ROW 6 (S-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	2.5		14	2.8		27	3.0		40	1.7		53	2.5	
2	0		15	2.2		28	3.3		41	1.9		54	1.4	
3	0.9		16	3.7		29	2.9		42	3.3		55	3.0	
4	2.6		17	3.8		30	3.5		43	2.2		56	3.8	
5	4.5		18	3.9		31	3.1		44	2.8		57	1.7	
6	4.0		19	1.0		32	0.6		45	2.5		58	2.5	
7	5.5		20	4.5		33	3.6		46	2.7		59	2.0	
8	2.8		21	2.5		34	4.8		47	0		60	2.1	
9	3.0		22	2.9		35	3.5		48	4.8		61	1.4	
10	0		23	0.9		36	1.0		49	1.0		62	2.5	
11	0		24	3.4		37	2.9		50	1.6				
12	2.5		25	2.4		38	2.2		51	2.6				
13	1.3		26	1.0		39	2.8		52	1.4				
29.6			35.0			37.2			28.5			22.9		

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 6 = 2.64

Number of dead trees = 4

ROW 16 (S-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	3.8		20	1.7		39	3.6		58	3.9		77	0	
2	4.0		21	0.6		40	1.4		59	3.8		78	2.2	
3	4.9		22	4.6		41	3.0		60	4.6		79	3.3	
4	3.9		23	4.5		42	1.7		61	3.5		80	1.5	
5	2.8		24	3.6		43	3.0		62	0.8		81	0.6	
6	3.8		25	1.8		44	5.1		63	2.1		82	2.0	
7	2.7		26	0		45	3.4		64	0.9		83	0	
8	2.3		27	3.4		46	3.0		65	2.3		84	0	
9	4.7		28	2.6		47	3.3		66	2.0		85	1.3	
10	3.0		29	4.0		48	2.6		67	3.3		86	1.4	
11	4.0		30	3.4		49	1.3		68	5.0		87	2.8	
12	6.7		31	3.5		50	4.6		69	4.1		88	0	
13	4.0		32	2.0		51	4.2		70	2.3		89	0	
14	2.5		33	4.6		52	3.9		71	4.3		90	0	
15	2.7		34	4.0		53	0		72	2.4		91	0.9	
16	2.5		35	2.2		54	2.8		73	3.5		92	0.5	
17	4.5		36	0		55	4.6		74	2.4		93	0	
18	2.5		37	2.3		56	3.1		75	1.0				
19	0.9		38	3.9		57	2.7		76	0.4				
66.2			52.7			57.3			52.6			16.5		

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 16 = 2.96

Number of dead trees = 10

VERDGROW (page 2)

ROW 26 (S-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	4.3		28	0		55	2.9		82	3.0		109	2.9	
2	3.8		29	0		56	3.9		83	1.0		110	1.8	
3	5.6		30	0		57	2.8		84	0		111	2.9	
4	3.8		31	2.5		58	3.3		85	0		112	3.6	
5	5.4		32	2.5		59	4.5		86	0.6		113	1.3	
6	2.8		33	3.2		60	0		87	1.2		114	2.6	
7	2.5		34	2.5		61	3.9		88	1.4		115	2.7	
8	4.4		35	4.6		62	4.2		89	0.5		116	1.6	
9	3.5		36	0.9		63	3.5		90	0.7		117	1.9	
10	5.0		37	4.0		64	3.0		91	0		118	0.9	
11	3.7		38	4.4		65	4.4		92	0.6		119	1.3	
12	0		39	3.6		66	0		93	0.9		120	1.0	
13	2.4		40	2.0		67	1.5		94	1.2		121	2.4	
14	4.1		41	4.0		68	4.0		95	1.9		122	1.9	
15	4.2		42	4.0		69	1.3		96	2.5		123	3.5	
16	4.0		43	4.5		70	3.8		97	3.0		124	3.7	
17	4.6		44	5.6		71	4.8		98	0.7		125	3.5	
18	4.7		45	3.6		72	2.5		99	0.7		126	2.4	
19	2.2		46	1.0		73	4.2		100	0.6		127	1.7	
20	2.5		47	2.4		74	2.9		101	0		128	0	
21	2.4		48	6.6		75	1.0		102	0		129	0	
22	0		49	6.3		76	3.4		103	0		130	0	
23	0		50	5.5		77	3.2		104	0		131	1.0	
24	0		51	5.0		78	3.0		105	0		132	0	
25	0		52	2.8		79	2.6		106	1.2				
26	0		53	3.5		80	3.7		107	2.8				
27	2.5		54	4.1		81	3.7		108	3.3				

78.4

89.1

82

27.8

44.6

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 26 = 2.95

Number of dead trees = 23

#### 4.6 Haynes

Jim Haynes planted one acre of eucalyptus in January of 1986, before he actually joined the Agroforestry Demonstration Program. Although nearly 1/3 of the seedlings were lost to frost damage, the trees were originally spaced at 3' X 5' so that densities sufficient for study remained after the initial mortalities. In May and June of 1986 approximately 5 1/2 more acres of eucalyptus were planted as part of the Agroforestry Demonstration Program. Poplars, mesquite, and casuarina were also planted on the farm in April, June, and July, respectively. In April of 1987 an additional 10,000 seedlings were planted. At approximately six months of age the trees showed variable growth, depending on the soil conditions, ranging from under 2 feet in highly saline areas to over 10 feet in the better soils.

Because this planting is surrounded by native habitat rather than cultivated fields it has experienced more severe pest problems than most of the other farms. Within one week of planting rabbits had destroyed 95% of the casuarina. Plastic guards were effective in protecting the remaining seedlings. The rabbits damaged some of the eucalyptus but did not appear to like to eat them as they did the casuarina. The poplars are barely staying alive and have suffered from grasshopper damage.

An interesting dilemma has arisen in relation to weed control. Although the field has many weeds, when extensive weed control was tried in one area the rabbits moved in and damaged or killed the trees. Very little weed control has been implemented.

This agroforestry planting is monitored by the Hanford office of the USDA-SCS. Results of previous monitoring and analyses are in the farm report. This farm is also part of the CSUF - Department of Biology wildlife study, which is further discussed in Section 7.0. Cuttings from the two-year-old trees will be used for the selection and propagation study in 1988.


# HAYNES AGROFORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PLANTINGS

observation well = ⊗



not to scale

300 Casuarina  
planted July 3, 1986



AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY

file: AGFOHAYN

last update: 9/30/87

county: KINGS

farm: HAYNES                      acreage: 11.3                      av.tr/ac: 2253

PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	21650	3194	0	0	300	250	70	25464
1/86	plant 1 acre Eucalyptus			3194						
4/23/86	DULAS	CHAPMAN						250		250
5/1/86	SJW	L.ALBACUT	4600							4600
5/28/86	replanted 10%, 145 trees?									
6/9/86	CDF	L.ALBACUT	2200							2200
6/9/86	UCR	Hemet forliso, New Mexico, West Moreland							70	70
7/3/86	CORNFL	AUSTRALIA					300			300
7/18/86	replant 288 trees?									
10/86	replanted some casuarina?									
4/11/87	CDF	L.ALBACUTYA	14850							

Comments:

Mo./Yr.	4/86	10/86	3/87	5/87	9/87
	Jan. spacing 3' X 5' lost ~33% of Jan. planting, mainly due to frost, over irri- gating So. end, but corrected	rabbits destroyed 95% of the casuarina immed. aft. planting, Euc. w/ D<1/4 inch installed protectors, cut down, not eaten mesq. spacing 10'X10' poplars just staying alive, grasshopper damage	Rabbits eat casuarinas w/o guards, some small are severe, new plant- ing spaced 5'X4' (? see 9/87 entry)	Due to dry year rabbit problems	1987 planting on 6 ac, spacing 3.5'X 5'

SOILS	Mo./Yr.	86	3/87	5/87
Lab Analysis:		saline sodic w/ Ca+Mg, trees do well with EC 20.2 or 13,184 ppm Ca+Mg 32mg/l, take longer w/ 0 Ca+Mg also see HAYNSOIL	see HAYNSOIL	see HAYNSOIL

Amendments:		none	none
Fertilizer:	none	tablespoon 15-15-15 per tree	tablespoon 15-15-15 per tree, 3 applic. from 1/87 to 5/87

IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:		
Date	canal Ec X 1000	well Ec X 1000
86	0.04 (25 ppm)	ave 1.4 (895 ppm) little/no Ca+Mg
Mar-87	0.08	0.27 to 1.27
May-87	0.04	1.2 to 2.0

Amount & Mo./Yr.	86	3/87	5/87
Frequency:	Apr, May, Jun 1X a week,	Field: 1 2 times	FIELD: 1 1 time
	over irrig., July 2, 13	2 Avg @ 3 wk	2 1 time
	or 8+18?, Aug 13, 87,	3 Avg @ 2 wk	3 @ 2 weeks
	Sept 1, 2Xs in Oct	4 2 times	4 bef. & aft. planting

#### WATER TABLE

Water Table Depths (feet)(4/86 - 10/86 from haynwatr):

	08-Apr-86	24-Apr-86	22-Jul-86	01-Oct-86	
	Apr-86	Apr-86	Jul-86	Oct-86	May-87
NE well	18	32			
NW well	18				
E side				0.67	
WELL #					
1		6.2	7		>7
2		6.5	7.4		7.2
3		9	7.6		7.3
4			7		8.1
5			5.8		6.5
6			6		6.6
7			5.5		6.1

#### Lab Analysis:

Electric Conductivity (Ec X 1000) OF GROUND WATER (from haynwatr)

	08-Apr-86	24-Apr-86	22-Jul-86	01-Oct-86
	Apr-86	Apr-86	Jul-86	Oct-86
NE well	0.17	0.90		
NW well	0.25			
E side				9.6
WELL #				
1		0.77		
2		3.0	2.8	
3		2.8	4.3	
4			1.2	
5			22.2	
6			0.50	
7			44.0	

See HAYNWATR for more detail

TREES:	Mo./Yr.	12/86	3/87	5/87
Growth:		see	Field 1 ave. 5 ft,	excellent Field 3
		HAYNGROW	31% died	(irrigated @ 2 weeks)
			(69% survival)	other fair to good

#### Lab Analysis:

wood	-	-
leaves	-	-



WEEDS

Mo./Yr.

86

3/87

5/87

very little or no weed  
control, when tried ex-  
tensive control in one  
area rabbits moved in

-

no control

HAYNES

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: HAYNWATR

last update: 9/1/87

## WATER DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH feet	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOUT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	REMARKS
4/8/86	NE well	18		0.17	1.7		0.1	1.0	0.7	1.0	0.7	
	NW well	18		0.25	2.5		0.2	2.0	0.5	0.4	0.7	
4/24/86	NE well	32		0.90	9.0		0.3	3.0	6.0			
	1	6.2		0.77								
	2	6.5		3.0								
	3	9.0		2.8								
7/22/86	1	7.0										
	2	7.4		2.8	30							
	3	7.6		4.3	48							
	4	7.0		1.2	12							
	5	5.8		22.2	300		4.7	47	253			
	6	6.0		0.50	5.0							
	7	5.5		44.0	640		62.0	620	20			

Wells # 1 - 4 east of canal

Wells # 5-7 west of canal

HAYNES

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: HAYNSOIL

last update: 9/1/87

## SOIL DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH inches	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOUT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	REMARKS
4/86	well 2 #1	0 - 12		20.2	260		3.2	32	228	57	59	
	well 2 #2	12 - 24		24.8	400		3.9	39	361	82	88	
	well 2 #3	24 - 40		22.7	290		3.3	33	257	63	67	
	well 1	0 - 12		1.51	15.0		0.1	1.0	14.0	20	22	
	well 3	0 - 12		4.6	52.0		0.6	6.0	51.4	30	30	
	near tree	0 - 12		7.6	90.0		2.9	29	61	16	15	
10/1/86	1	0 - 8	9.5	9.6	118		0.10	1.0	117	165	169	East side N.S. middle dead trees
	2	0 - 8	8.5	5.0	56			7.1	48.9	26	28	Trees alive 6 - 7' tall
	3	0 - 8	8.2	52.6	700			67	633	109	116	Dead, planted twice
12/86	well 1 #1	0 - 12	8.4	18	230		3.3	30.3	200	52		45 planted 5-6-86
	well 1 #2	12 - 24	8.5	33	450		6.0	60	390	71		68 trees 3' - 4' tall
	well 1 #3	24 - 36	8.5	32	420		9.0	90	330	49		45
	well 1 #4	36 - 48	8.6	80	1100		21.5	210.5	890	271	263	
	well 1 #5	48 - 52	8.4	53	790		14.5	140.5	650	78	75	
4/87	field #3	0 - 12	9.0	25.5	340		1.8	18.0	322	107		dead trees

HAYNES

disk: AGROFORESTRY 11 file: HAYNGROW

## TREE GROWTH DATA

Dec, 1986

## EAST FIELD

## ROW 6 FROM EAST SIDE (W-S)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	0.7		28	1.8		55	0.1		82	0		109	6.2	0.30
2	3.1		29	1.8		56	0		83	0.5		110	6	0.25
3	0.2		30	0		57	0		84	0		111	8.0	0.53
4	0.4		31	1.8		58	0		85	0		112	5.6	0.15
5	?		32	1.9		59	0.1		86	0		113	6.3	0.35
6	1.6		33	0.2		60	0		87	2.0		114	6	0.20
7	1.8		34	0		61	0		88	4.0	0.10	115	3.8	
8	0		35	0.9		62	0		89	3.9		116	4.7	0.05
9	0		36	3.8		63	0		90	1.2		117	0	
10	0.2		37	0		64	0		91	4.0		118	4.4	
11	0		38	3.5		65	0.6		92	5.9	0.25	119	4.2	
12	0		39	4.6		66	0		93	5.0	0.10	120	4.3	
13	0		40	0		67	0		94	6.1	0.25	121	0	
14	0		41	0		68	0		95	5.0	0.10	122	2.0	
15	3.0		42	0		69	0		96	4.4		123	0	
16	3.0		43	0.4		70	0		97	4.7	0.05	124	0.8	
17	1.5		44	0		71	0		98	4.2		125	1.0	
18	3.6		45	0		72	0		99	5.5	0.15	126	0	
19	6.3	0.25	46	0.3		73	0		100	1.6		127	2.0	
20	3.1		47	0		74	2.6		101	5.5	0.15	128	0	
21	0		48	0.7		75	4.0		102	4.0		129	0	
22	0		49	0.7		76	5.3	0.10	103	4.0		130	0	
23	1.9		50	0		77	0.6		104	5.3	0.15	131	0	
24	0		51	0		78	0		105	7.2	0.35			
25	1.9		52	0		79	5.3	0.15	106	4.9	0.10			
26	0		53	0		80	4.0		107	5.3	0.20			
27	0		54	0		81	4.7	0.05	108	6.8	0.25			
subtot	32.3	0.25	22.4	0.00		27.3	0.30		101	2.20		65.3	1.83	
# of DBH data		1		0			3			14			7	

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 6 = 1.99

AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 6 = 0.183

No. dead trees = 54.0

## NORTHWEST FIELD

## ROW 8 FROM EAST (N-S)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	2.6		20	1.3		39	0		58	2.6		77	1.9	
2	3.3		21	3.7		40	0.2		59	0		78	?	
3	2.0		22	4.6		41	2.5		60	2.2		79	?	
4	5.5		23	3.4		42	2.1		61	0		80	3.0	
5	3.0		24	1.0		43	0		62	2.3		81	0	
6	4.2		25	3.0		44	0		63	2.3		82	2.9	
7	4.2		26	0		45	0		64	1.0		83	2.6	
8	3.7		27	2.3		46	0		65	2.6				
9	3.6		28	0.6		47	0.5		66	2.4				
10	2.4		29	0		48	0		67	1.3				
11	4.4		30	0.2		49	2.0		68	0				
12	4.3		31	0.3		50	0.2		69	0				
13	4.0		32	2.2		51	1.6		70	2.0				
14	4.2		33	4.5		52	0		71	?				
15	1.5		34	3.4		53	2.1		72	1.6				
16	4.5		35	0.1		54	0		73	1.3				
17	3.3		36	0.1		55	2.7		74	0				
18	3.3		37	3.4		56	2.5		75	1.0				
19	1.4		38	2.3		57	3.3		76	2.0				
65.4			36.4			19.7			24.6			10.4		

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 8 = 2.45

No. dead trees = 16.0

## NORTHWEST FIELD

## ROW 16 FROM EAST (N-S)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	0		18	0		35	0		52	0		69	2.7	
2	0.4		19	0		36	0		53	0		70	3.4	
3	0.3		20	0		37	1.9		54	0		71	0	
4	2.0		21	0		38	0		55	1.8		72	0	
5	0		22	0		39	0		56	3.3		73	0	
6	0		23	0		40	2.6		57	2.6		74	0	
7	0.4		24	0		41	0		58	0		75	0	
8	0.4		25	0		42	0		59	1.0		76	0	
9	0.4		26	0		43	2.1		60	2.0		77	0	
10	2.2		27	0		44	3.3		61	1.8				
11	2.0		28	0		45	4.4		62	1.2				
12	1.0		29	0		46	0		63	0				
13	0		30	0		47	0		64	0				
14	0		31	0		48	0.9		65	0				
15	0		32	0		49	2.7		66	0				
16	0		33	0		50	0		67	0				
17	0		34	0		51	0		68	0				
subtot 9.1			0.0			17.9			13.7			6.1		
# of DBH data			0			0			0			0		

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 16 1.9

AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 16 = ERR

No. dead trees = 52

## SOUTHWEST FIELD

## ROW 15 FROM SOUTH (E-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	3.5		5	4.5	0.125	9	3.7		13	0.1875		17	1.1	
2	3.9		6	4.5	0.125	10	3.7		14	0.125		18	0	
3	3.9		7	5.9	0.1875	11	3.5		15	3.8		19	4.0	
4	2.1		8	3.9		12	2.3		16	2.3				

subtot	13.4	0.0	18.8	0.4		13.2	0.0		6.4	0.0		5.1	0.0	
# of DBH data		0		3			0			0			0	

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 15 = 3.2      AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 15 = 0.146      No. dead trees = 1

## SOUTH WEST PLANTING

## ROW 31 FROM S (E-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	6.0	0.2	11	0		21	4.5		31	2.0		41	3.4	
2	5.9	0.2	12	0		22	2.5		32	4.0		42	4.0	
3	6.8	0.25	13	4.6		23	2.0		33	3.0		43	2.0	
4	8.6	0.4	14	7.3	0.5	24	0		34	3.0		44	1.4	
5	2.5	0.4	15	6.5	0.3	25	0		35	0		45	0	
6	6.4	0.3	16	7.8	0.4	26	4.7		36	0		46	0	
7	3.3		17	1.2		27	3.0		37	1.6		47	0	
8	0.3		18	7.2	0.35	28	5.5	0.15	38	0				
9	0.3		19	7.2	0.4	29	4.3		39	1.6				
10	0		20	9.0	0.7	30	5.0	0.1	40	0				

subtot	40.1	1.8	50.8	2.7		31.5	0.3		15.2	0.0		10.8	0.0	
# of DBH data		6		6			2			0			0	

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 31 = 4.2      AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 31 = 0.332      No. dead trees = 12

## SOUTHWEST PLANTING

## ROW 40 FROM SOUTH (W-E)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	4.0		9	0		17	5.5	0.15	25	4.0		33	7.6	0.4
2	4.5		10	1.0		18	4.9	0.10	26	7.9	0.4	34	9.7	0.7
3	7.6	0.4	11	4.5		19	4.0		27	9.8	0.8	35	6.1	0.2
4	7.2	0.3	12	2.5		20	2.8		28	7.5	0.6	36	5.0	0.2
5	8.6	0.6	13	4.0		21	1.6		29	9.3	0.7	37	7.2	0.3
6	7.6	0.4	14	4.8	0.05	22	1.2		30	10.4	0.8	38	5.2	0.1
7	6.2	0.25	15	3.5		23	1.7		31	8.3	0.6	39	2.7	
8	1.3		16	4.9	0.05	24	2.8		32	6.6	0.25	40	2.6	

subtot	47.0	2.0	25.2	0.1		24.5	0.3		63.8	4.2		46.1	1.9	
# of DBH data		5		2			2			7			6	

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 40 = 5.3      AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 40 = 0.380      No. dead trees = 1.0

## SOUTHWEST PLANTING

## ROW 58 FROM SOUTH (E-W)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	4.9	0.10	9	8.3	0.50	17	6.4	0.25	25	3.5		33	1.6	
2	0		10	9.2	0.70	18	3.2		26	3.0		34	0	
3	2.5		11	9.3	0.70	19	2.3		27	2.3		35	0	
4	4.0		12	7.7	0.50	20	2.5		28	0		36	0	
5	2.9		13	8.1	0.60	21	1.0		29	2.7		37	0	
6	7.6	0.35	14	10.8	0.80	22	2.4		30	0				
7	6.1	0.30	15	8.9	0.70	23	2.3		31	3.3				
8	5.2	0.15	16	8.5	0.80	24	0		32	2.3				

subtot	33.2	0.9	70.8	5.3	20.1	0.3	17.1	0.0	1.6	0.0
# of DBH data	4		8		1		0		0	

AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 58 = 4.9      AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 58 = 0.496      No. dead trees = 8.0

## SOUTHWEST PLANTING

## ROW 74 FROM SOUTH (W-E)

TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)	TREE #	HEIGHT (feet)	DBH (inches)
1	1.2		9	9.2		17	8.3	0.50	25	6.3	0.10
2	2.4		10	9.3	0.70	18	10.2	0.90	26	7.0	
3	5.8	0.20	11	10.2	1.00	19	8.0	0.52	27	4.0	
4	8.8	0.50	12	9.8	1.01	20	7.5	0.40	28	3.0	
5	5.0	0.20	13	7.0	0.40	21	7.0	0.35	29	5.0	
6	1.4		14	4.5	0.10	22	3.5		30	6.5	0.25
7	9.3	0.55	15	10.3	1.10	23	6.7	0.25	31	5.0	0.10
8	9.8	0.60	16	9.9	1.00	24	3.7	0.30			

subtot	43.7	2.1	70.2	5.3	54.9	3.2	36.8	0.5	0.0	0.0
# of DBH data	5		7		7		3		0	


AVERAGE HEIGHT FOR ROW 74 = 6.6      AVERAGE DBH FOR ROW 74 = 0.501      No. dead trees = 0.0

#### 4.7 Way Farms

The Way Farms agroforestry plantation was planted with 600 poplar cuttings and 11,900 Eucalyptus camaldulensis seedlings (Lake Albacutya seed source) in April and May of 1986. Some of the poplar cuttings were held in cold storage for one month prior to planting and this appears to have had an effect on their growth. They were slower at leafing out and a few of the cuttings died. The Oregon poplar variety has grown well, reaching heights of about 6 feet only 6 months after planting. The eucalyptus have grown well, with the exception of those in the north east corner where the soil is highly saline. Some leaf damage was experienced by trees on the north end due to cotton defoliant. The leaves spotted but did not fall and the trees recovered by the beginning of 1987. Although the lower 1/3 of the field was in standing water for most of the winter, the trees do not appear to have been adversely affected. No weed control has been used on this field and although there is a weed problem, once the trees grow to a suitable height they appear to out-compete the weeds.

Observation well monitoring and lab analysis of water and soil samples have been performed by the Bakersfield office of the USDA-SCS. In addition, soil and water samples taken in May 1987 were sent to Dellavalle Labs. These results are included in the following farm report. Trees from this farm will be used next year in the selection and propagation study.

# WAY FARM AGROFORESTRY PLANTINGS



observation well = Ø  
soil sample area = □



## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/3/87

file: AGFOWAY

county: KERN

farm: WAY acreage: 11.5 av. tr/ac: 1087

## PLANTINGS

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr. tot.
		total:	11900	0	0	0	0	600	0	12500
4/23/86	ZAPATTINI							100		
4/23/86	OULAS	CHAPMAN						500		
5/9/86	COF	L.ALBACUT	11900							

## Comments:

Mo./Yr.	5/86	3/87	6/87
	poplar planting, some cuttings show buds, others still dormant, few dead, maj. look good, Zappattini look poor (held in cold storage 1 month), Euc look good	Leaf damage on No. end from cotton defoliant leaves spotted but no leaf fall, some frost, cultivated 1X, some trees dying lower 1/3 field in standing water	Appear to have recovered from fall cotton defoliant damage. Healthier than in Jan. NE portion of field remains marginal in tree prodn. & size

SOILS	Mo./yr.	86	3/87	7/87
Lab Analysis:		see WAYSOIL, see file for description of soils in area	Sample 1 2 3 4 5	Ec 1.4 2.9 3.7 1.2 15.6
				SAR see WAYSOIL 71 12 17 65 39
			(sample depth = 3.6")	

Quarter	3/87
Amendments:	-

Fertilizer:	-
-------------	---

## IRRIGATION WATER

Quarter	3/87
Lab Analysis:	-

Amounts & Frequency:	-
----------------------	---

## WATER TABLE

Depth:	28-Oct-86									
WELL #	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87	
3	4.9			4.9					3.9	
4	5.4			5					4.6	
5	5.6			5.8					3.8	
6	5.2			5.3					4.3	
7	6.3								4.3	

Lab Analysis: also see WAYWATR

WELL #	28-Oct-86								
	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87
	Ec								Ec
3	3.6								2.6
4	5.5								6.6
5	3.2								9.3
6	3.6								4.8
7									6.9
ditch									1.1

WELL #	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87
	SAR								SAR
3	37								20.4
4	42								44.9
5	31								79.1
6	38								35.4
7									47.4
ditch									6.53

conflicting report (DBASE 870618)

	EC	SAR	
	Oct-86	Oct-86	
3	3.6	37	for more detail
4	5.5	42	see WAYWATR
5*	4.7	31	
6*	3.2	22	
7*	3.6	38	

#### TREES

Mo./Yr.	10/86	3/87	6/87
Growth:	doing exceptionally well, ave 5-6', smallest in areas of high salinity w/ 6'+ trees on outer perimeter, Oregon poplar about 6' & look strong	ave. Euc. 5 to 6 ft., poplar ave. 6 ft. (in 3/87 report but same as 10/86) 1"-2" new growth also see WAYGROW	see map in file for visual aspects ave 8"-12" new growth also see WAYGROW

#### Lab Analysis:

wood	-
leaves	-

#### WEEDS

Mo./Yr.	3/87	6/87
	no herbicides	plagued with weeds (from Williams report)

## WAY FARMS

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: WAYWATR

last update: 9/3/87

## WATER DATA

DATE	WELL #	DEPTH feet	pH	EC x 1000 mmhos	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	TOTAL SALTS meq/l
10-28-86	3	4.9		3.6			0.2	2	37	37		39
	4	5.4		5.5			0.4	4	60	42		64
	5	5.6		4.7			0.5	5	49	31		54
	6	5.2		3.2			0.4	4	31	22		35
	7	6.25		3.6			0.1	1	38	38		39
Jan 87	3	4.9										
	4	5										
	5	5.8										
	6	5.3										
6-15-87	3	3.9		2.6		1	0.3	3	25	20.4		28
	4	4.6		6.6		1	0.5	5	71	44.9		76
	5	3.8		9.3		1	0.5	5	125	79.1		130
	6	4.3		4.8		1	0.4	4	50	35.4		54
	7	4.3		6.9		1	0.5	5	75	47.4		80
	ditch	0		1.1		1	0.3	3	8	6.53		11

Ditch is located along west boundary of agroforestry field

5/5/87

Dellavalle Labs

Well #4 (see map in file for location)

## Undigested Sample

EC	Ca	Mg	Na	SAR	SAR	Cl	CO <sub>3</sub> +HCO <sub>3</sub>	SO <sub>4</sub> -S	B
dS/m	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l		adj	Meq/l	Meq/l	mg/l	mg/l
2.57	5.7	2.2	20.5	10.3	25.8	10.0	9.5	1100	1.5
NO <sub>3</sub> -N	Fe	Mn	Li	F	pH				
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l					
0.3	<0.1	<0.05	<0.04	0.66	7.3				

## Digested Sample

P	K	Zn	Mn	Na	Fe	Cu	Ca	Mg	Be
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
0.3	9.6	0.1	0.05	293	0.6	<0.1	89.2	26.8	<0.025
V	Pb	Cr	Cd	As	Hg	Se	Mo	Al	Si
mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
<0.08	0.2	<0.25	<0.025	6	3.9	<2	<0.1	0.7	18.9

WAY FARMS

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: WAYSOIL

last update: 9/3/87

## SOIL DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH inches	EC X 1000 mmhos	TOTAL VERSINATE		Ca+Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	REMARKS
				SALTS	TITRATION				
6-23-87	1	0 - 6	2.6						non-saline
	1	12	1.0						non-saline
	2	0 - 6	9.6						moderately saline
	2	12	8.4						moderately saline
10-28-86	1	3 - 6	1.4	14	0.4	4	10	7.1	see map in
	2	3 - 6	2.9	32	0.8	8	24	12	file for
	3	3 - 6	3.7	42	0.8	8	34	17	locations
	4	3 - 6	1.2	11	0.3	3	8	6.5	
	5	3 - 6	15.6	200	3.6	36	164	39	

Dellavalle Labs

5/5/87

-----Undigested-----										
SP	pHs	ECe	Ca	Mg	Na	Cl	ESP	B	NO3-N	PO4-P
		dS/m	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l	Meq/l		mg/l	mg/kg	mg/kg
35	7.9	3.1	8.2	2.6	22	19.2	11	1.4	4	10

-----Undigested-----					
K (AA)	Zn	Mn	Fe	Cu	SO4-S
mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg
272	2.3	16.0	31.0	3.2	66


-----DTPA Extract-----				-----Saturated Paste Extract-----						
Ni	Pb	Cr	Cd	Hg	As	Se	NO3-N	PO4-P	K	SO4-S
mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
1.0	1.2	<0.25	0.092	1.2	58	2	0.3	5	15	190

#### 4.8 Arthur Williams & Sons

Thirteen acres on the Williams farm were planted with 15,000 *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* (half from Alice Springs and half from Lake Albacutya), 1,000 casuarina, and 80 mesquite (from New Mexico and West Moreland) in May, June, and July of 1986. A high mortality rate (around 50%) was experienced with the seedlings; this is thought to have been caused by high air and soil temperatures at the time of planting and high soil salinity. The tendency of the soil to crack as it dries, tearing the roots of the plants apart, may also have contributed to the mortality problem. The casuarina were hand planted and immediately irrigated with good water and thus faired better than the previously planted eucalyptus, for which irrigation was delayed for 1 to 2 days after planting. Although the casuarina suffered animal damage (rabbits), they have regrown. By the beginning of 1987 surviving trees ranged from 6 to 6.5 feet in height. The field has not been weeded and thus suffers from heavy weed competition.

Soil analyses, taken in November of 1986 from areas with average growth, poor growth, no growth of trees but growth of weeds, and no growth of trees or weeds, revealed that those areas in which all of the seedlings had died had SAR levels (see glossary) twice those for the areas in which the trees had survived. The best growth occurred in the area with the lowest EC and SAR readings. The USDA-SCS in Bakersfield conducts the soil and water analyses and monitors the site. Details of the above mentioned analyses can be found in the farm report.

# WILLIAMS AGROFORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PLANTINGS



13 acres  
not to scale  
soil sample area = □

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/3/87

file: AGFOWILL

county: KERN

farm: WILLIAMS                      acreage: 13                      av.tr/ac: 1237

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	15000	0	0	0	1000	0	80	16080
5/13/86	SJM	ALICE SPR	7500							
		L ALBACUT	7500							
6/16/86	UCR	NEW MEX.							80	
		W MORELND								
7/8/86	CORNFL	AUSTRALIA					1000			

## Comments:

Mo./Yr	6/86	7/86	3/87	6/87
	Euc doing poorly, ~50% loss, planted between furrows so there would be no problem wetting, as soil dries it forms cracks, some roots torn apart, tire damage noted, rec'd freq. irrig. keep ground moist	hand planted casuarina, immed. followed w/ irrig. water, so far look good, cas suffered rodent damage, is regrowing	high mortality, probably due to high Na in soil, 100 F+ during planting, mortality now stabilized	Information from WAY file

## SOILS also see WILLSOIL

site description in file

Lab Analysis: 6/23/86                      Nov. 86

Sample	Sample #	Ec	SAR
Depth			
0-6"	1	14.6	32
	2	24	78
12"	3	15.4	38
	4	7.6	61

(taken at 3 to 8 in. depth)

Mo./Yr. 3/87

Amendments: -

Fertilizer: -

## IRRIGATION WATER

Mo./Yr. 3/87 6/87

Lab Analysis: - EC X 1000  
0.3  
(well water)  
see WILLWATR for detailed analysis

Amounts and                    -    irrig. 3 times  
 Frequency:                    since Jan. 1, cur-  
                                       rently using 24 hr  
                                       sets, last irrig.  
                                       completed June 4

#### WATER TABLE

Depth:

29-Oct-86

Oct-86

WELL # 1      5.15

WELL # 2      9.0

Lab Analysis:                    -

Electric Conductivity (EC)

29-Oct-86

Oct-86

WELL # 1      0.9

WELL # 2      2.4

SAR

29-Oct-86

Oct-86

WELL # 1      8

WELL # 2      19.0

TREES	Mo./Yr.	1/87	3/87	6/87
Growth:		height ranges from	-	see map in file
		inches to 6-6.5 ft		for visual aspect

Lab Analysis:

wood                                -

leaves                              -

#### WEEDS

Mo./Yr.	9/86	3/87	6/87
weed competition		-	field plagued
is bad			with weeds



ARTHUR WILLIAMS &amp; SONS

disc: AGROFORESTRY 11 file: WILLWATR  
last update: 9/17/87

## WATER DATA

DATE	WELL #	DEPTH feet	pH	EC x 1000 mmhos	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOT mls	VERSIHATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	TOTAL SALTS meq/l	REMARKS
29-Oct-86	1	5.15		0.9							8		
	2	9.0		2.4						19			
26-Jun-87	Irrig. Ditch	n/a		0.3		1	0.1	1	2	3			3 Irrigation water

ARTHUR WILLIAMS &amp; SONS

disc: AGROFORESTRY 11 file: WILLSOIL  
last update: 9/3/87


## SOIL DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH inches	pH	EC x 1000 meq/l	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOT mls	VERSIHATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	TOTAL SALTS meq/l	REMARKS
6/3/86	1	0 - 6		8.4								very strongly saline
	2	12		44.00								
11/4/86	1	3 - 6		14.6			4.3	43	147	32	190	see map in file
	2	3 - 6		24			2.8	28	292	78	320	for locations
	3	3 - 6		15.4			3.5	35	160	38	195	
	4	3 - 6		7.6			0.4	4	86	61	90	

#### 4.9 Buttonwillow Land and Cattle Co.

Although nearly 1/3 of the 4.5 acres of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* planted on this trial plantation died soon after planting, the remainder of the field has done surprisingly well. These trees ranged from 4 to 6 feet in height five months after planting, with 25% to 30% around 6 feet tall. Soil samples analysed by the USDA-SCS in Bakersfield revealed that the areas of initial die-off were very strongly saline and sodic. Surviving trees were in moderately saline and slightly sodic and in slightly saline soils. Soil samples from this farm have also been sent to Della-valle Labs for analysis. These analyses are included in the farm report. Because these trees seem to be growing well under saline conditions cuttings will be used in 1988 for the selection and propagation project.

BUTTONWILLOW LAND CO.  
AGROFORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PLANTINGS



## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/10/87

file: AGFOBUTT

county: KERN

farm: BUTTONWILLOW acreage: 4.5 av.tr/ac: 1143

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	5144	0	0	0	0	0	0	5144

5/2/86 SJN L.ALBACUT 5144

## Comments:

Mo./Yr.	5/86	3/87	6/87
spacing 88" X 5',		initial die off	Status has re-
upper ~1/3 looks		stabilized, hi Ec	mained the same
dead, prob. sal-		& SAR in mortality	since last report
inity, rest looks		area (1/3 area)	Report in WAY file
good			

## SOILS

Ground condition at time of planting:

1st 1/3? cloddy &amp; rough, last 3/4? looked good

See file for soil description

Lab Analysis: see BUTTSOIL

Mo./Yr.	3/87	7/87

Amendments: -

Fertilizer: -

## IRRIGATION WATER

Mo./Yr	5/86	3/87

Lab Analysis: -

Amount & hand watered with

Frequency: 1 qt/tree . -

## WATER TABLE

Water Table Depth feet):

DATE	29-Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87
WELL #									
1	5.15							dry	4.8
2	9.01								7.3

## Lab Analysis:

Ec of Ground Water

DATE	29-Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87
WELL #									
1	0.88								1.02
2	2.4								6.3

# SAR of Ground Water

DATE	29-Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87	May-87	Jun-87
WELL #									
1	8								12.7
2	19								61.2

see BUTTWATR for  
more detail

## TREES

Mo./Yr.	10/86	6/87
Growth:	4 - 6 ft w/ 25- 30% at 6', doing well except in high Na areas,	see map in file for specific height & new growth

## Lab Analysis:

wood	-
leaves	-

## WEEDS

Quarter	3/87
	-

BUTTONWILLOW LAND CO.

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: BUTTWATR

last update: 9/10/87

WATER DATA

DATE	WELL #	DEPTH feet	pH	EC x 1000 mmhos	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQVOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	TOTAL SALTS meq/l	REMARKS
29-Oct-86	1	5.15		0.88			0.2	2	8	8		10	
	2	9.01		2.4			0.3	3	23	19		26	
05-May-87	1	well dry											
26-Jun-87	1	4.8		1.02		1	0.1	1	9	12.7		10	
	2	7.3		6.3		1	0.3	3	75	61.2		78	

BUTTONWILLOW FARMS

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: BUTTSOIL

last update: 9/10/87

SOIL DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	TEXTURE	pH	EC X 1000 mmhos	TOTAL SALTS	VERSINATE TITRATION	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	REMARKS
23-Jul-86	S-1	c	8.5	45	640	17.2	34.4	606	146	very strongly saline & sodic
	S-2	c		25	350	16.6	33.2	317	77	very strongly saline & sodic
	S-3	c		8.7	100	18	36	64	15	mod. saline & slightly sodic
	S-4	c		6.9						slightly saline
see map in file for sample locations										
Nov-86	1			14.6					32	
	2			24					78	
	3			15.4					38	
	4			7.6					61	

Dellavalle Labs

5/5/87

-----Undigested-----										
SP	pHs	ECe dS/m	Ca Meq/l	Mg Meq/l	Na Meq/l	Cl Meq/l	ESP	B mg/l	NO3-N mg/kg	PO4-P mg/kg
75	8.1	13.8	25	4.9	134	55	33	3.7	6	49

-----Undigested-----					
K (AA)	Zn	Mn	Fe	Cu	SO4-S
mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg
481	3.5	9.8	46.0	4.8	739

-----DTPA Extract-----					-----Saturated Paste Extract-----					
Ni	Pb	Cr	Cd	Hg	As	Se	NO3-N	PO4-P	K	SO4-S
mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	mg/kg	ug/l	ug/l	ug/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l	mg/l
0.2	1.2	<0.25	0.1	4.6	18	<2	0.4	5	294	1680

SECTION 4.10

Allen Ranch

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY

file: AGFOALLE

last update: 9/17/87

county: FRESNO

farm: ALLEN                      acreage: 5                      av.tr/ac: 1400

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	6500	0	0	0	500	0	0	7000
7/9/86	SJM	L.ALBACUT	6500							
?	?	?					500			
?	SJM	MT BERNSTEAD	?							

## Comments:

Mo./Yr.    3/87                      6/87  
 look very    doing very well, well  
 good, trees    cared for, blanks will  
 staked        be replanted w/trees  
                  from other plantings  
                  in the area, outer row  
                  of cas on windward  
                  side appears to be a  
                  good practice

SOILS    Mo./Yr.                      3/87

Lab Analysis:                      none

Amendments:                      none

Fertilizer:                      none

## IRRIGATION WATER

Mo./Yr.                      3/87

Lab Analysis:                      Ec of sump  
water= 7.0Irrigation Amounts    sprinkler,  
and Frequency:        ~1.5 ac. ft

## WATER TABLE

Depth (feet):

	29-Oct-86	30-Dec-86	26-Feb-87	20-Apr-87	29-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87
	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-87	Mar-87	Apr-87
north end	5.67		5.58		4.67		4.5
south end	6		6.17		5.83		4.83

## Lab Analysis:

Electric Conductivity (Ec) of Water Table

	29-Oct-86	30-Dec-86	26-Feb-86	20-Apr-87	29-May-87	23-Jun-87	20-Jul-87
	Oct-86	Nov-86	Dec-86	Jan-87	Feb-86	Mar-87	Apr-87
north end	11				10.3		9.9
south end	4.3				3.7		5.2



**TREES**


Mo./Yr.	3/87	6/87
Growth:	no record	ave. ht. ~5 ft. survival rate >95%
Lab Analysis:	none	
Wood		
Leaves		

**WEEDS**

Mo./Yr.	3/87	6/87
	Adequate, Chem. sprays & by hand	Fusilade & Goal in combinaton with Roundup


# WATER TABLE DEPTH

ALLEN RANCH



# EC OF GROUND WATER

ALLEN RANCH



SECTION 4.11  
Kings Boys Ranch

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/17/87

file: AGFOBOYS

county: KINGS

farm: KINGS BOYS RANCH acreage: 1.93 av.tr/ac: 1140

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	2200	0	0	0	0	0	0	2200

6/17/86 CDF L.ALBACUT 2200

7/18/86 Replants? Mt. Bernstead

? wind break trees, Rose Gum &amp; Mana Gum?

## Comments:

Mo./Yr 86 3/87  
 hard time estab. soils hi in Na, low  
 Euc, lost >50% in Ca+Mg, water  
 from 1st planting standing in fur-  
 rows since Oct 1

## SOILS

Lab Analysis: see BOYSSOIL

Mo./Yr. 86 3/87  
 Amendments: -- pit run gypsum  
 around each tree

Fertilizer: ~5 tons dairy none  
 manure before  
 planting

## IRRIGATION WATER

Mo./Yr. 3/87

Lab Analysis: Canal Ec = 0.10  
 Pump Ec = 1.7  
 pH = 9.5  
 Ca+Mg = 1.0  
 Na = 16  
 N = 0.15  
 (no units given)

Amount &amp; 1986

Frequency: 6/18 pum 9/10  
 6/30 canl 9/23  
 well Ec = 1.27 7/18 10/5  
 7/29 10/20  
 8/4 (?) 11/9  
 8/18

WATER TABLE

	Mo./Yr.	7/86	3/87
Depth (feet):	ave. 2 holes		10.7
	= 10.6		

Lab Analysis:	-	-
---------------	---	---

TREES	Mo./Yr.	3/87
Growth:		Ave growth 2.2 ft 17% died(83% surv.) Mt. Benstead out-grow Albacutya

Lab Analysis:		
wood		-
leaves		-

WEEDS	Quarter	86	3/87
		disked between rows & hoed around some trees	no control, furrow between rows twice

BOYS RANCH

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: BOYSWATR

last update: 8/21/87

WATER DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH feet	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	REMARKS
7/86	average 2 holes	10.6										
3/87		10.7										

BOYS RANCH

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: BOYSSOIL

last update: 8/21/87

SOIL DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH inches	pH	EC x 1000	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	REMARKS
7/86	alive		9.2	8.4	100			2.0	98	98		
	dead		10.7	18.6	240			1.0	239	341		

SECTION 4.12

Bloemhof Agricultural Enterprises

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY

file: AGFOBLOE

last update: 9/17/87

county: KERN

farm: BLOEMHOF

acreage: 18.7

av.tr/ac: 1738

some tree replants, info est. 1146 trees/ac

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	31500	0	0	0	1000	0	0	32500

6/26/86 SJN NAPERBY 26000

&amp; 6/29/86

7/3/86 CORNFL AUSTRALIA

1000

7/3/86 SJN MT.BERNST 5500  
5000?

## Comments:

Mo./Yr. 6/86

7/86

10/86

6/87

planted trees in  
bottom of furrows  
instead of top so  
they would get  
water, weather  
hot & dry, high  
mortality

replants look  
good, casuarina  
look good, re-  
plants on west  
side of field

plantings hit hard  
by hi Na in soil,  
rabbit damage,  
prefer Cas., tree  
guards installed  
survival 10-20%,

planting appears  
to be very margin-  
al, would recom-  
mend that more  
water be applied,  
grower not avail-  
able for comment  
Report in WAY file

## SOILS (see file for site description)

Lab Analysis: see BLOESOIL

Mo./Yr. 3/87

Amendments: -

Fertilizer: -

## IRRIGATION WATER

Quarter 3/87 6/87

Lab Analysis: - EC X 1000  
0.6for more detail  
see BLOEWATR

Amount and

Frequency: -

## WATER TABLE

Water Table Depths (feet)

Mo./Yr. 10/28/86 1/20/87 6/87

Well #

1	7.6	dry	5.3
2	7.9	8.8	5.8
3	8.7	8.6	6.2
4	7.2	8.6	6.8
5	8.1	8.7	6.3
6	8.0	8.9	5.1
7	7.9	8.4	5.3



# Analysis of Ground Water

also see BLOEWATR

Quarter	10/28/86			1/15/87			6/87	
	Ec	SAR	Ec X 1000	SAR	Ec X 1000		SAR	
Well #	-----							
1	88	210	29	97	45		179	
2	63	159	5.6	18	62		221	
3	27	87	41	177	32		126	
4	47	123	50	156	69		224	
5	88	219	0	-	26		111	
6	30	77	47	169	68		212	
7	71	23	54	188	7		27	

## TREES

Mo./Yr.	3/87	6/87
Growth:	1 - 3 ft, 10-20% survival	see map in file for ave growth

## Lab Analysis:

Wood	-
Leaves	-

## WEEDS

Mo./Yr.	3/87
	-

BLOEMHOF AG ENTERPRISES

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: BLOEWATR

last update: 9/17/87

## WATER DATA

DATE	WELL #	DEPTH feet	pH	EC x 1000 mmhos	CATIONS meq/l	ALIQOUT mls	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	TOTAL SALTS meq/l	REMARKS
28-Oct-86	1	7.6		88			6.9	69	1231	210		1300	
	2	7.9		63			6.1	61	879	159		930	
	3	8.7		27			3.2	32	348	87		380	
	4	7.2		47			4.9	49	611	123		660	
	5	8.1		88			6.4	64	1236	219		1300	
	6	8.0		30			4.3	43	357	77		400	
	7	7.9		7.1			1.7	17	66	23		83	
15-Jan-87	1		6.7	29			2.9	29	371	97		400	
	2		6.3	5.6			1.5	15	49	18		64	
	3		6.8	41			2.0	20	560	177		580	
	4		6.6	50			3.6	36	664	156		700	
	5		6.6	0			0.1	1	-	-		-	
	6		7.1	47			2.8	28	632	169		660	
	7		7.3	54			3.0	30	730	188		760	
			pH may be depth re- ported in wrong row										
22-Jun-87	1	5.3		45		1	2.3	23	607	179		630	
	2	5.8		62		1	3.1	31	869	221		900	
	3	6.2		32		1	2.1	21	409	126		430	
	4	6.8		69		1	3.6	36	949	224		995	
	5	6.3		26		1	1.8	18	332	111		350	
	6	5.1		68		1	4	40	950	212		990	
	7	5.3		7		1	1.3	13	69	27		82	
	canal	n/a		0.6		1	0.25	2.5	4.5	4		7	

BLOEMHOF AG

disc: AGROFORESTRY II

file: BLOESOIL

last update: 9/17/87

## SOIL DATA

DATE	SAMPLE #	DEPTH inches	pH	EC x 1000 mmhos	CATIONS meq/l	VERSINATE mls	Ca + Mg meq/l	Na meq/l	SAR	ESP	TOTAL SALTS meq/l	REMARKS
28-Oct-86	1	3 - 8		37		4.5	45	465	98		510	saline-sodic
	2	3 - 8		5.8		4.6	46	22	4.6		68	saline
	3	3 - 8		28		3.5	35	255	61		380	saline-sodic
	4	3 - 8		24.5		3.4	34	299	73		333	saline-sodic

see map in file for sample locations

SECTION 4.13

Other Farm Reports

Gowen  
Meyers  
Orton  
Rio Vista  
Rowan  
Stanton  
Stratford Public Utility  
Tulare Lake Drainage District  
Van Groninger

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 7/7/87

file: AGFOGOWE

county: FRESNO

farm: GOWEN                      acreage: 1                      av.tr/ac: 1588

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-GLA	CAS-CUM	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	gr.tot.
		total:	1060	0	0	0	528	0	0	1588
5/28/86	CDF	L.ALBACUT	1060							
5/28/86	CORNFL	AUSTRALIA					528			

Quarter 3/87

Comments: trees look average  
aqueduct seepage  
seems to keep the  
water table high

## SOILS

Quarter 3/87

Lab Analysis: -  
Amendments: none  
Fertilizer: none

## IRRIGATION WATER

Quarter

Lab Analysis: good quality  
Westlands waterAmounts & ~1 ft during 1986  
Frequency: after planting

## WATER TABLE

Quarter 3/87

Depth: 24 inches

Lab Analysis: Ec = 2 to 3  
prior to planting

## TREES

Quarter 3/87

Growth: -  
Lab Analysis:  
wood -  
leaves -

WEEDS Quarter 3/87

chemical sprays &  
hand weeding  
adequate

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/24/87

file: AGFOMEYE

county: FRESNO

farm: MEYERS                      acreage: 28                      av.tr/ac: 1371

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	ELDERICA PINE	gr.tot.
		total:	38000	0	0	0	0	0	400	38400
8/20/87	CDF	L.ALBACUT	20000							
8/20/87	SJF	L.ALBACUT	18000							
8/20/87		MONOEL PINE							400	

Comments: Mo./Yr.                      9/87  
                    planted for ero-  
                    sion control, west  
                    of 1-5 on sloping  
                    ground, spacing  
                    6.5' X 5'

## SOILS

Lab Analysis:  
Amendments:  
Fertilizer:

## IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:

Amounts &  
Frequency:

## WATER TABLE

Depth:

Lab Analysis:

## TREES

Growth:  
Lab Analysis:  
wood  
leaves

## WEEOS

AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/25/87

file: AGFOORTO

county: KINGS

farm: ORTON acreage: 4 av.tr/ac: 1500

PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	ELDERICA PINE	gr.tot.
		total:	6000	0	0	0	0	0	0	6000
7/8/87	CDF		6000							

Comments: Mo./Yr. 9/87

SOILS

Lab Analysis:  
Amendments:  
Fertilizer:

IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:

Amounts &  
Frequency:

WATER TABLE

Depth:

Lab Analysis:

TREES

Growth:  
Lab Analysis:  
wood  
leaves

WEEDS

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/30/87

file: AGFORIOV

county: KINGS

farm: RIO VISTA                      acreage: 1.19                      av.tr/ac: 378

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	ELDERICA PINE	gr.tot.
		total:	450	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
8/4/87	CDF	L.ALBACUTYA	450							

Comments: Mo./Yr. 9/87  
             spaced 6'X 8',  
             2 rows, 2600' long?  
             planted as an inter-  
             ceptor

## SOILS

Lab Analysis:  
Amendments:  
Fertilizer:

## IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:

Amounts &  
Frequency:

## WATER TABLE

Depth:

Lab Analysis:

## TREES

Growth:

Lab Analysis:  
wood  
leaves

## WEEDS

AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/30/87

file: AGFOROWA

county: KINGS

farm: ROWAN                      acreage: 2                      av.tr/ac: 1816

PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	ELDERICA PINE	gr.tot.
		total:	3631	0	0	0	0	0	0	3631
'87	SJN	L.ALBACUTYA	3631							

Comments: Mo./Yr. 9/87  
'87 planting info  
incomplete, spacing  
4'X 5', 5 plantings?

	#rows	#trees
#1	29	1,089
#2	23	726
#3	32	908
#4	22	545
#5	22	363

SOILS

Lab Analysis:  
Amendments:  
Fertilizer:

IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:

Amounts &  
Frequency:

WATER TABLE

Depth:

Lab Analysis:

TREES

Growth:  
Lab Analysis:  
wood  
leaves

WEEDS



AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/25/87

file: AGFOSTAN

county: KINGS

farm: STANTON      acreage: 2      av.tr/ac: 1500

PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	ELDERICA PINE	gr.tot.
		total:	3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	3000
7/14/87	CDF		3000							

Comments: Mo./Yr.      9/87

SOILS

Lab Analysis:  
Amendments:  
Fertilizer:

IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:

Amounts &  
Frequency:

WATER TABLE

Depth:

Lab Analysis:

TREES

Growth:  
Lab Analysis:  
wood  
leaves

WEEDS

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/30/87

file: AGFOSTRA

county: KINGS

farm: STRATFORD  
PUBLIC UTILITY

acreage: 7 av.tr/ac: 1600

## PLANTING

DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	ELDERICA PINE	gr.tot.
		total:	11200	0	0	0	0	0	0	11200
9/10/87	CDF	L.ALBACUTYA	11200							

Comments: Mo./Yr. 9/87  
ave. spaced 4.5'X 6'  
in 112 rows  
4 rows w/ more  
gypsum?(note)

## SOILS

Lab Analysis:  
Amendments:  
Fertilizer:

## IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:

Amounts &  
Frequency:

## WATER TABLE

Depth:

Lab Analysis:

## TREES

Growth:  
Lab Analysis:  
wood  
leaves

## WEEDS

# AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/30/87

file: AGFOTULA

county: KINGS

farm: TULARE LAKE acreage: 3.4 av.tr/ac: 794  
DRAINAGE DISTRICT

PLANTING		ELDERICA								
DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	PINE	gr.tot.
		total:	2100	400	0	200	0	0	0	2700
5/1/87	CDF	L.ALBACUTYA	2000							
5/1/87	CORNFLOWER	C. glauca				200				
5/1/87	SJF	MT BERNSTEAD	100							
5/1/87	FOOTE	FOOTSEI		400						

Comments: Mo./Yr. 9/87  
for '87 planting all  
spaced 5'X 6', CDF in  
25 rows on 3 ac, Cas  
3 rows on 0.15 ac,  
Bern in 2 rows on .05  
ac, Foote in 4 rows  
on .20 ac  
Showing stress?

## SOILS

Lab Analysis:  
Amendments:  
Fertilizer:

## IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:

Amounts &  
Frequency:

## WATER TABLE

Depth:

Lab Analysis:

## TREES

Growth:

Lab Analysis:  
wood  
leaves

## WEEDS

## AGROFORESTRY - TREE PLANTING

disc: AGROFORESTRY  
last update: 9/30/87

file: AGFOVANG

county: KINGS

farm: VAN GRONINGER      acreage: 0.04      av.tr/ac: 1750

PLANTING									ELDERICA	
DATE	NURSERY	SOURCE	EUCA-CAM	EUCA-oth	CAS-CUN	CAS-oth	POPLAR	MESQUITE	PINE	gr.tot.
		total:	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
7/18/87	CDF	L.ALBACUTYA	70							

Comments: Mo./Yr. 9/87  
spaced 4'X 6'  
in 10 rows

## SOILS

Lab Analysis:  
Amendments:  
Fertilizer:

## IRRIGATION WATER

Lab Analysis:

Amounts &  
Frequency:

## WATER TABLE

Depth:

Lab Analysis:

## TREES

Growth:  
Lab Analysis:  
wood  
leaves

## WEEDS

## SECTION 5.0

### Tree Selection and Propagation Project

Roy Woodward, Roy Sachs and Miles Merwin (ITCI)  
Department of Environmental Horticulture  
University of California, Davis



# Propagation of Salt Tolerant *Eucalyptus* and *Casuarina*

Progress Report  
August 1987

Roy Woodward, Roy Sachs and Miles Merwin  
Department of Environmental Horticulture  
University of California, Davis

## INTRODUCTION

For many years certain tree species in Israel, China, and Australia have been grown with saline irrigation water. An agroforestry plantation on a saline site irrigated with saline water can improve the quality of the land, the quality of subsequent drainage water, and provide important forest biomass on sites that would otherwise be unproductive.

Plantations of hardwood tree species established in California in the past few years have exhibited great variation in survival, growth, and tree form when grown under saline conditions. Selection and clonal propagation of outstanding individual trees from existing plantations will provide a source of trees with known performance for use in future plantations in the San Joaquin Valley.

## PROGRESS TO DATE

Selections of superior *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* (Red Gum), *Casuarina glauca* and *Casuarina cunninghamiana* (Beefwood) were made at Murrieta Farms and at the Peck Ranch in Fresno County. Trees were selected on the basis of height, basal diameter, form (straightness and unforked trunk), and general appearance of good health with a requirement that the plantation be two-years-old and have undergone irrigation with saline water. 20 *E. camaldulensis*, 9 *C. cunninghamiana*, and 2 *C. glauca* were selected at Murrieta Farms, and 14 *E. camaldulensis* and 4 *C. cunninghamiana* were selected at the Peck Ranch.

The selected trees were labelled and cut-off at the base in February 1987 leaving a 15 cm tall stump. These trees were revisited in April 1987 and stump sprouts were removed from 22 of the *E. camaldulensis*. None of the *Casuarina* had sprouted sufficiently to provide cuttings at this time. These cuttings were taken to UCD and rooted in heated mist benches. After rooting, the trees were replanted in individual containers and maintained in greenhouses at UCD from which subsequent cuttings can be taken. About 250 trees were successfully rooted from these initial cuttings.

The field sites were revisited in August 1987 and cuttings collected from 21 *E. camaldulensis*. These cuttings are now in the rooting benches at UCD and should provide an additional 500 rooted



cuttings. The authors would like to thank Lu Lohr (UCD Department of Agricultural Economics) for her help with the field collections in April and August.

As stated above, none of the sprouts of *Casuarina* were big enough for cutting in April, but cuttings were collected from 4 large, uncut *C. glauca* and 4 *C. cunninghamiana* adjacent to the cut stumps. An attempt to root these cuttings produced only 8 rooted *C. glauca*. Collections of *Casuarina* were made in August from cut stumps at Peck Ranch, but none of the stumps at Murrieta Farms had sprouted adequately to provide cuttings, and in fact many of the stumps had apparently died. It is expected that about 100 rooted trees will be obtained from the cuttings collected in August.

Some of the originally selected *Eucalyptus* were not relocated during subsequent visits. The denseness of the stands and the weed situation (at Peck Ranch the weeds are over 2 m tall and form a solid wall throughout the plantation) made finding the cut stumps very difficult. Other trees have proven to have poor rooting properties and will not be used in subsequent tests.

In general, cutting of select trees for production of sprouts that can be used to obtain rooted cuttings has been a success. There seems to be a correlation between the apparent health of a tree in the field and the ability of the tree to root; healthier trees root faster and more prolifically.

The goal of making rooted cuttings was to obtain 3,000 trees for field planting in spring 1988. This goal will be achieved in the following ways; 1) one additional visit to the field sites will be made in October 1987 to collect stump sprouts, 2) additional cuttings will be derived from previously rooted trees at UCD, 3) seedling trees will be started at UCD from selected salt-tolerant seed from Australia and Israel, 4) rooted cuttings will be made of other select *E. camaldulensis* found to have exceptional growth at non-saline sites, such as the C-2 'Dale Chapman' clone.

Samples of rooted trees will undergo salinity screening in the laboratory at UCD. Trees in containers will be watered with increasing levels of saline solutions and the survival/growth of each tree monitored. Additional tree sections will be placed in the Scanning Calorimeter and subjected to increasing saline conditions and the temperature of metabolism measured with increasing stress. Sufficient rooted material now exists for these tests to commence in September 1987. We feel that the performance (survival and growth characteristics) of the cloned material in plantations grown under

saline conditions can be correlated with the laboratory measurements to provide a means of screening future populations of trees prior to outplanting on saline sites.

Selections of the salt tolerant trees will also be included in cold tolerance screening that is now being conducted at UCD. We have obtained a growth chamber (in cooperation with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection) with which the temperature and lighting environment of containerized trees can be controlled over extended periods of time. Using this chamber the trees can be subjected to freezing conditions simulating cold-season events in the San Joaquin Valley. Trees not showing a capability of withstanding winter conditions will be eliminated from future use.

### FUTURE RESEARCH

During the next six months additional trees will be selected from saline sites in the San Joaquin Valley. Because of the previously successful work of CDFA, many plantations will be two years old this next year and the number of trees available to make selections will increase tremendously. These trees will be prepared to obtain cuttings in the spring-summer of 1988.

Rooted cuttings from existing field grown trees and those selected in the future will be used to continue the screening process for saline and cold tolerance in the laboratory. It is important that the growth characteristics of the trees be evaluated in the laboratory in order to operate an economical and successful rooted cutting program.

Micropropagation and clonal *in vitro* methods will be attempted with selected trees to increase the reliability and speed with which superior trees can be obtained for field planting. The efficacy of establishing seed plantations in California will also become more apparent as a result of this work.

The 3,000 rooted cuttings and seedlings will be planted in spring 1988 in an experiment to assess the practicality of using hardwood species for saline water management. Survival and growth measurements of these field planted trees will be important in determining the future direction of superior tree selection, laboratory screening procedures, salt-balance experiments, and bio-filter research.

SECTION 6.0

Economic and Marketing Study

Luanne Lohr  
Department of Agricultural Economics  
University of California, Davis



# QUARTERLY REPORT ON AGROFORESTRY PROJECT - ECONOMICS

Luanne Lohr - University of California, Davis

August 31, 1987

## I. INTRODUCTION

The economic analysis of the California Department of Food and Agriculture's (CDFA) agroforestry project was begun in April 1987. The primary objectives during the first five months have been to 1) develop theoretical models for the biological and economic aspects of tree growth and 2) to collect data for estimating these models.

~~An overview of the economic project is given by the flow chart in Figure 1.~~ There are three phases of analysis: 1) the tree production function, 2) the net present value model of tree farming, and 3) the comparison of returns from conventional crops and trees. ~~Necessary functional and data inputs are listed at each step.~~ Collection of data for all phases is taking place simultaneously, in order to maintain as much consistency as possible across models, and to identify data deficiencies early in the project.

Each of the three phases is explained in the following sections. Progress toward completing each part is also described, along with plans for further work.

## II. TREE PRODUCTION FUNCTION

In this phase, we will be developing a model for predicting the growth of short rotation trees species under differing climatological, site, and treatment conditions. Previous models of tree growth in California are not site-specific and are not based on cultural techniques which are being employed in the San Joaquin Valley (SJV).

Thus, they do not capture the variability across sites on which short rotation trees are or may be grown, including important factors like salinity.

Additionally, models such as that developed by the University of California Cooperative Extension in Forestry (UC Coop Extension), are based on a forestry concepts requiring previous growth information. For areas where tree farming is not now practiced, the index (low, medium, and high) must be guessed.

For this project, we are collecting climatological data for experimental and commercial sites for which data on growth and treatments for several species are available. Using regression techniques, we will determine the influence of these factors on growth of short rotation species. The regression results can be used to predict future growth for various regions in California. The equation may be used to provide farm-specific estimates of expected yield for farmers who are considering planting trees.

Data has been collected from experimental plots at UC Riverside, UC Davis, and the UC Sierra Agricultural Field Station, from growers in the SJV project, and from published sources on other experimental and commercial stands. Site characteristics such as soil type and use limitations and climatological data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) such as precipitation and temperature readings have also been collected. This data set is being used to estimation a regression relationship for growth.

The growth function determined can be used to generate yield per acre under differing conditions. Yield is related to growth by tree height and diameter at breast height measurements, as well as by

percentage moisture. Yield functions will be determined from the literature and from discussions with UC Coop Extension and UC Environmental Horticulture personnel.

The results obtained from this portion of the project will be verified in four ways. First, predictions from this model will be compared with simulation results of the UC Coop Extension model and of standard theoretical models in the forestry literature. Development of models to use for comparison are proceeding now.

Second, more data will be collected from a statewide agroforestry inventory and production cost survey. A screening questionnaire is being prepared to determine where existing stands of Eucalyptus and Casuarina are located. Suitable respondents for a more detailed cost of production survey will be identified through this process.

The results of this survey will be used to verify both the growth model and the net present value models discussed below. The advantages of this data are that it will represent a larger cross-section of sites where agroforestry may be practiced, and it will provide information about different-aged trees. The inventory of current trees will help in the assessment of potential market demand for short rotation trees. Both the screening questionnaire and the detailed survey are being prepared for mailing now.

Third, we will continue to obtain growth data directly from CDFA from the agroforestry project as it becomes available. This data may be used both to update the data set for the model and to verify directly the predictions of the growth curve.

Finally, we will submit the estimated model and its predictions to experts in the area for their review. Comments by these specialists

will be taken into account in the final design of the growth function and subsequent production model.

### III. NET PRESENT VALUE OF TREE FARMING

We will assess the net present value of tree farming during this phase of the project. A theoretical mathematical optimization model has been constructed which includes cost functions for planting, growing, harvesting, and transporting short rotation trees. Empirical data for estimating these functions will come from the results of the SJV agroforestry survey and the statewide cost of production survey. The advantage of this data is that it represents costs due to actual production practices, which may not necessarily represent ideal, least cost techniques.

Engineering data on costs is also being collected to verify the empirical data and to fill gaps in information about least cost practices. This data is being obtained from CDFA and UC Coop Extension.

Prices and transportation costs depend on which end use is selected for the trees. Existing end uses include chips for pulping, chips for cogeneration, and cordwood for residential use. Potential uses include chips for export, use as a chemical feedstock, and ethanol production. The location of the buyers and the price they currently pay for wood or for substitutes will determine the transportation costs and prices they can afford for SJV wood products. An additional factor is the amount of short rotation trees currently being grown in California and their market availability.

Location data is being collected from listings and maps of current and potential users of short rotation trees. Prices are being obtained by telephone contact with these consumers and from published sources.



UC Coop Extension is surveying cogenerators about the amounts of wood and prices paid for them. They have agreed to share this data with us when the survey is completed.

Other benefits to tree farming in the SJV will be assessed as information on them becomes available. Possibilities for other revenue include honey production and the selling of private hunting permits.

Linear or quadratic programming will most likely be used to determine the optimal economic rotation of the tree stands. This may or may not match recommendations currently being made on the basis of physical maturity, but should enable farm-specific planning to maximize returns. Dynamic programming will probably be used to determine these returns once the optimal rotation period is known. The specification of these models and the coding of them for computer analysis is underway.

#### IV. OPTIMAL MIX OF CONVENTIONAL CROPS AND TREE FARMING

Growing trees in the SJV may serve two purposes. First, tree farming may be an additional source of revenue for farmers, given the relatively high salt tolerance of several species. They may be planted in fields as crops are and given special treatment which will maximize their growth.

A second, and more environmentally crucial use is as a partial solution to drainage and salinity problems in the area. Short rotation trees may be able to lower water tables, intercept lateral runoff flows, and serve as disposal sites for tile drainage water. These benefits may be measured by the costs of projects such as evaporation ponds which would be reduced or eliminated due to growing trees. These avoided costs will be included in the final analysis of the best mix of trees and crops.

For this phase, data is being collected on prices and costs associated with growing conventional crops in the SJV. Also, engineering estimates of the costs of projects necessary to control salinity and drainage problems will be obtained.

A mathematical optimization model will be used to determine the best mix of trees and crops under particular technical and financial constraints faced by farmers. The development of this model and the relevant constraints is proceeding. Estimation will take place when all necessary data and functional inputs have been obtained.

SECTION 7.0

Wildlife Study

Andrew R. Dyer and David L. Chesemore  
Department of Biology  
California State University, Fresno



# AGROFORESTRY PROJECT

The Use of Cultivated, Salt-Tolerant  
Vegetation by Wildlife- I

Quarterly Report Number 1

By: Andrew R. Dyer and David L. Chesemore

Department of Biology  
California State University, Fresno  
Fresno, California 93740-0073  
(209) 294- 2010 or 2001

Submitted to: Dr. Vashek Cervinka

California Department of Food and Agriculture  
in partial fulfillment  
of Agreement No. 9076

15 September 1987

## SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

June-August, 1987

The following pages summarize much of the data collected during the period June-August, 1987. There is more data that has yet to be fully analyzed and which will be reported later. This report contains survey information on the species of mammals, birds, herpetofauna and herbaceous vegetation found to date in the six study sites of the Agroforestry Project. Additionally, some analysis of this preliminary data has also been offered.

The 3 months of the project so far have been spent collecting as much base information as possible and has focused primarily on identification of species and measurement of trees. The point quarter method of measuring tree size and density was used for all sites, 50 points per site, and that information is being studied. Clip plot and line intercept methods were also used to quantify species' cover and diversity and to make early estimates of biomass and are included here.

Mammal trapping methods were employed using Sherman Live traps on established trapping grids for each site. Trap success and species information is summarized here for approximately 2000 trap nights. Additional survey trap lines are not discussed, but any new species recorded are included on the species lists. Trapping data was gathered on 8 by 8 trapping grids with bird seed used as bait.

Recapture methods were employed with success, but data will be reported after more information has been gathered. Each site was trapped for 5 nights simultaneously with 3 or more of the other sites for a total of about 300 trap nights per site.

Bird observations and counts were made at set stations for 6 minute intervals. A total of 10 sets of 6 minute observation intervals were recorded for each site. The information is summarized in the bird list.

Information regarding the herpetofauna of the sites was gathered on a general survey basis. At this point it can be stated that numbers and diversity of herpetofauna are extremely low with few exceptions. Data will be gathered coincidentally with that for other animal groups for the duration of the project.

The information presented here reflects much of the activity of the summer months. Later reports will include data on scent stations, permanent marked-recapture of rodents, owl pellet analysis, home range size and foraging patterns of certain rodents, and nesting success of birds. Additionally, multiple regression analysis of tree growth rates will be summarized for the 6 sites.

## ALLEN RANCH

The Allen site is a 5 acre plot approximately 100 feet wide and half a mile long. The trees are arranged in 11 rows of Eucalyptus at the south end and widening to 14 rows at the northern end. A single row of Casuarina border the western side. The site is bordered on the east side by an irrigation canal that continuously holds water; a small drainage canal borders on the north and only occasionally holds water. Opposite the northeast corner is a row of Tamarisk trees of undetermined age that shelters large numbers of roosting and nesting birds as well as mammals such as the coyote. The row of trees is about 50 m. long and 10 m. wide.

The site is actively managed; ground cover is very low (<1%). The trees have also been pruned .3-.5 m. off the ground. The trash from the pruning has been left on the site.

The site has proven to have a very dense population of rodents, particularly the Deer Mouse, Peromyscus maniculatus. There are numbers of pocket gophers (Thomomys bottae) as well although so far they are known solely from evidence of burrowing. A large number of birds have been sighted at the site although most were flying overhead in the direction of the Mendota Wildlife Refuge. Nesting has not been noted in the trees, but a large number of nests have been found in the Tamarisk row to the northeast. That corner of the plot is a very active area for birds.



## MURIELTA RANCH

The Murielita Ranch site is the largest of the six sites and one of the most diverse in a number of ways. The two-year-old section (north side) is comprised of 3 rows of Poplars, 3 rows of Casuarina of 2 species and 7 rows of Eucalyptus. Very few of the Poplars survived to the second year; the Casuarina and Eucalyptus however have reached heights of 7 m. The ground cover in this area (Section 4) is about 2% with very low diversity. The rodents to date are exclusively Peromyscus maniculatus and are present in large numbers although accurate density levels are not yet available. This section is bounded on the north side by bare ground and a small drainage canal, normally dry.

The one-year-old trees have been divided into 3 sections for sampling purposes because the percentage of ground cover and the size of the trees was highly variable. It is difficult to accurately measure the density of herbaceous plants and ground cover because of the weed control activities taking place on the site, but it was felt at the time of sampling that stratification of the site was justified. This may not be true in the future, especially as the Eucalyptus canopy begins to close. Section 1 is the main body of one year old trees and is distinguished by moderate ground cover (25%) and a generally smaller size for the trees. Section 2 is a strip along the southeastern side approximately 100 m. long by 30 m. wide with ground cover estimated at 60%. Section 3 is the southeast corner. Earlier in the year

samples were taken. The trees are appreciably larger than those of similar age in other parts of the site. Additionally, Section 3 has much higher densities of Morning Glory, Convolvulus arvensis, and Curl, Dock, Rumex crispus, than other areas.

The younger sections are comprised of 3 rows of Casuarina immediately adjacent to the older trees of the site and 68 rows of Eucalyptus to the south. In addition to a large population of Peromyscus, this site has also yielded two species of Muridae: the house mouse (Mus musculus) and the black rat (Rattus rattus). There does not seem to be large numbers of these two however.

Nesting has been observed in the two year old Casuarina on several occasions. Nests discovered in June and July appeared to belong to House Finches (Carpodacus mexicanus) and Blackbirds (Euphagus cyanocephalus and Agelaius phoeniceus californicus), however no successful fledging was observed. In August, Mourning Dove nests were found with eggs and half-grown young. To this point, no nesting has been observed in the Eucalyptus regardless of age on this site. Abandoned nests found around the Casuarina appeared to have been victimized by predators and/or windthrow. There are also birds nesting around the site and making use of the trees. In particular, Western Kingbirds (Tyrannus verticalis), Barn Swallows (Hirundo rustica) and Killdeer (Charadrius vociferus) have been observed. Other water birds use the freshwater pond, but no nesting activity has been observed. However, the ranch foreman has informed the investigators that a Green-winged Teal (Anas carolinensis) successfully raised a brood in the spring of 1987.

## WAKEFIELD RANCH

The Wakefield Ranch site is considered to be a control site of sorts. Although it has a different composition and history, no runoff water is being applied. This site is about 1.5 h. in size and contains trees of varying ages; a range from 2 to 4 years with additional trees added at the discretion of the owner. The tree and weed sampling techniques were done with this in mind and the data are divided into three sections.

For this site, rodent levels are very low in comparison to other sites. The reasons for that are not immediately clear, but it may be tied to the drip irrigation practices now in place. Vegetative cover is very low except in the younger trees and plant diversity is correspondingly reduced.

Because of the age and height of the trees (10-12 m. at 4 years) large numbers of birds are active in the site. Diversity is not as high as other sites however. More nesting and roosting has been observed at Wakefield than elsewhere, especially for the Mourning Dove. Some migrants, such as the Western Tanager (Piranga ludoviciana) have also been making use of the cover offered by this site. Predatory birds, notably the Barn Owl (Tyto alba) and the Kestrel (Falco sparverius) use the older trees for roosting. There are a number of other nests and pieces of evidence that have not yet been identified or linked to a particular species. Additionally, because the amount of cover offered by the large trees hinders identification of some species of smaller birds; the list of birds for Wakefield is incomplete.

## FECK RANCH

The Feck site is situated approximately 1.5 km. south and east of the Waterfield site. Feck is unique in several ways. It is located adjacent to some 10 h. of evaporation ponds that have had a marked influence on the character of the site. Water for the site has been pumped directed from the ponds to the trees. Additionally, no weed management practices are in effect and the herbaceous species are dominating the site.

Feck is 3.3 h. of one year old trees in approximately a square shape. There are 9 rows of *Casuarina* trees on the eastern edge that are generally very healthy. The rest of the site is composed of *Eucalyptus* of various sizes and heights. Although, weed species grow unchecked, the diversity of plantlife is low. Only three or four species are responsible for 99% of the cover; Mare's Tail, *Conyza canadensis*, Morning Glory, *Convolvulus arvensis* and Sunflower, *Helianthus annuus*. Of the three, *C. canadensis* makes up about 95% of the total.

The *Eucalyptus* trees of Feck appear to be struggling for survival. Many of the trees are yellowish rather than the dark green more common in other sites. This could be due to the high water table or to the quality of water used for irrigation. No irrigation has taken place since late May, 1987, yet the trees and weeds show no signs of water stress. This leads to the conclusion that the water table must be high enough to be accessed by the vegetation on the

site. Loss of individual trees can be traced to several causes. Several small trees were found either stripped of bark near the ground or with the roots or base gnawed through by rodents. Many smaller trees were found completely covered and pulled down by the weed species as well. C. arvensis commonly pulls the small trees down.

The degree to which the ground is covered and protected may account for the numbers and diversity of rodents found at Peck. To date Peromyscus maniculatus and the California Vole, Microtis californicus have been caught steadily and in large numbers.

As with Wakefield, the vegetation at Peck offers considerable cover and bird identification is often hampered. A number of species have been included on the Peck bird list due to being observed in and around the evaporation ponds to the north.

## THOMPSON RANCH

The Thompson site is about 24 h. to the south and east of the Pac' site and is similar in size and composition to the Allen site. The site is not as long as Allen, but is somewhat wider, the total being 2.4 h. The single row of Casuarina is found on the western edge. On the eastern edge for two thirds of the length from the south is a large holding ditch for runoff water similar to the one at Allen. An uncultivated field with uncontrolled weed species is located to the east of the northern half of the site. The side open to the fields, the western side, was on the edge of a tomato field through August.

Thompson is not irrigated regularly. The trees facing west are not as tall and robust as the rows farther in. Due to the heat and dryness of the summer many trees were observed in August bending down and with burnt and dried leaves.

Lack of irrigation water may also account for the sparse ground cover and low weed diversity at Thompson. Rodent captures were relatively low, about 40% of the capture rate found at Allen. Bird numbers and diversity were also reduced at this particular site. The only nest observed was a Western Kingbird on a telephone pole adjacent to the site.

## HAYNES RANCH

The Haynes Ranch site is located about 56 k. south of Fresno on Highway 41 in Kings County. The area is very different than that of the other five sites. As a consequence, the species composition is significantly different at every level. The site was formerly alkali scrub and is still surrounded by that type of vegetation. The soil is powdery and extremely saline. The trees are located immediately adjacent to the highway and on either side of a small irrigation canal carrying water from the Kings River. It is difficult to quantify the present dimensions of the site for a number of reasons. The site is split and the trees on either side of the canal are experiencing different growth patterns. The trees on the eastern side suffered high losses early on and it is now difficult to locate entire rows of trees. On the western side, the trees seemed to survive the initial planting, but have suffered from rodent depredation and water stress since then. An area of mesquite was included originally, but none of the trees are now more than a few inches in height. The site is too small to easily stratify for sampling, but there is also very little uniformity.

The weed species found at Haynes include species from other sites as well as a number found nowhere else. The species run the gamut from saltgrass (Distichlis) and spikeweed (Hemizonia) to wet species such as bulrushes (Scirpus). The eastern side tends to be drier and with more species found in arid conditions while the western side is dominated by grasses and Five Hook Bassia, Bassia

any of the sites.

The rodents in the area are also diverse, but somewhat peculiar. There are high numbers of Peromyscus and Dipodomys surrounding the site in the outlying vegetation, but the traps within the site were dominated by a single species, Mus musculus.

The birds numbers and diversity were also high. A number of species, such as Forster's Tern (Sterna forsteri) and the Western Bluebird (Sialia mexicana) indicate that Haynes may be in the path of travel for some species. A mating pair of Blue Grosbeaks (Guiraca caerulea) successfully fledged at least one young on the western side of the sight. The species is not common to that area.

The Haynes site also yielded a reptile, the Side-Blotched Lizard, Uta stansburiana, which is abundant around the site and makes some use of the margins.



# A G R I C U L T U R A L   F O R E S T R Y   P R O J E C T

## Mammal List

Common Name	Family	Scientific Name	A	M	W	P	T	H
<u>RODENTIA</u>								
Deer Mouse	Cricetidae	<i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i>	X	X	X	X	X	
S. Grasshopper Mouse	"	<i>Onychomys torridus</i>				X	X	
W. Harvest Mouse	"	<i>Reithrodontomys megalotis</i>		U		U		X
California Vole	"	<i>Microtus californicus</i>				X		
Heermann's Kangaroo Rat	Heteromyidae	<i>Dipodomys heermanni</i>						A
Valley Pocket Gopher	Geomysidae	<i>Thomomys bottae</i>	E			E		E
House Mouse	Muridae	<i>Mus musculus</i>		X				X
Black Rat	"	<i>Rattus rattus</i>		X				
<u>LAGOMORPHA</u>								
Blacktailed Jackrabbit	Leporidae	<i>Lepus californicus</i>	X	X				X
Desert Cottontail	"	<i>Sylvilagus auduboni</i>		X	X	X		X
<u>CARNIVORA</u>								
Coyote	Canidae	<i>Canis latrans</i>	E		E	E		E
Domestic Cat	Felidae	<i>Felis domesticus</i>						E

## Reptile List

Common Name	Family	Scientific Name	A	M	W	P	T	H
<u>SCAMATA</u>								
Side blotched Lizard	Iguanidae	<i>Uta stansburiana</i>						X
Gopher Snake	Colubridae	<i>Pituophis melanoleucus</i>						U

## Amphibian List

Common Name	Family	Scientific Name	A	M	W	P	T	H
<u>SALIENTIA</u>								
Bullfrog	Ranidae	<i>Rana catesbeiana</i>	A	A				A
Western Toad	Bufo	<i>Bufo boreas</i>	X		X		X	X

X= confirmed sighting or capture on the site  
 A= confirmed sighting or capture around the site  
 E= evidence of presence, i.e. prints, scat or burrows  
 U= unconfirmed sighting

# AGROFORESTRY PROJECT

## BIRD SIGHTING LIST

Common Name	Family	Scientific Name	A	M	W	F	T	H
Great Blue Heron	Ardeidae	<u>Ardea herodias</u>	0			A		0
Cattle Egret	"	<u>Egretta ibis</u>	(0)	A				A
Great Egret	"	<u>Ardea albus</u>	0	0				0
Snowy Egret	"	<u>Leucophaea thula</u>	0	0				
Mallard	Anatinae	<u>Anas platyrhynchos</u>	I				0	
Green-winged Teal	"	<u>Anas carolinensis</u>	(I)					
Turkey Vulture	Cathartidae	<u>Cathartes aura</u>		A				
Black-Shouldered Kite	Elanidae	<u>Elanus leucurus</u>	0	I			I	0
Sharp-Shinned Hawk	Accipitrinae	<u>Accipiter striatus</u>	A	A				
Red-tailed Hawk	Buteoninae	<u>Buteo jamaicensis</u>	A	A			A	A
Marsh Hawk	Circinae	<u>Circus cyaneus</u>		I			0	A
American Kestrel	Falconinae	<u>Falco sparverius</u>	A	A			I	A
Ringnecked Pheasant	Phasianidae	<u>Phasianus colchicus</u>	I					
American Coot	Rallidae	<u>Fulica americana</u>					A	
Killdeer	Charadriidae	<u>Charadrius vociferus</u>	A	I			A	A
Long-billed Curlew	Scolopacidae	<u>Numenius americanus</u>	0	0		A	A	0
Greater Yellowlegs	"	<u>Tringa flavipes</u>		A				
Least Sandpiper	"	<u>Erolia minutilla</u>		A				
American Avocet	Recurvirostridae	<u>Recurvirostra americana</u>		A			A	
Black-necked Stilt	"	<u>Himantopus mexicanus</u>	A	A			A	
California Gull	Larinae	<u>Larus californicus</u>	0			A		0
Forster's Tern	Sterninae	<u>Sterna forsteri</u>						0
Caspian Tern	"	<u>Hydroprogne caspia</u>				A		
Rock Dove (Pigeon)	Columbidae	<u>Columba livia</u>	0					
Mourning Dove	"	<u>Zenaidura macroura</u>	I	I		I	0	I
Barn Owl	Strigidae	<u>Tyto alba</u>				I	I	2
Great Horned Owl	"	<u>Bubo virginianus</u>				E		A
Long-eared Owl	"	<u>Asio otus</u>	E					

I= Observed perching or feeding on the site

0= Observed flying over the site

A= Seen adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site

E= Evidence of presence, i.e. pellets, nest

2= Remains found on site

()= Unconfirmed sighting

# A G R O F O R E S T R Y   P R O J E C T

## B I R D   S I G H T I N G   L I S T

Common Name	Family	Scientific Name	A	M	W	P	T	H
Lesser Nighthawk	Caprimulgidae	<u>Chordeiles acutipennis</u>	0					A
Hummingbirds	Trochilidae	(species not known)	I	I	I	I		
Western Kingbird	Tyrannidae	<u>Tyrannus verticalis</u>	I	I	I		I	I
Say's Phoebe	"	<u>Sayornis saya</u>	I				I	
Horned Lark	Alaudidae	<u>Eremophila alpestris</u>	A	A				A
Bank Swallow	Hirundinidae	<u>Hirundo riparia</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barn Swallow	"	<u>Hirundo rustica</u>	0	0	(0)		0	0
Common Crow	Corvidae	<u>Corvus brachyrhynchos</u>	A	A	I			
Mockingbird	Mimidae	<u>Mimus polyglottos</u>	A	I	I		I	I
American Robin	Turdidae	<u>Turdus migratorius</u>			I			A
Western Bluebird	"	<u>Sialia mexicana</u>						I
Loggerhead Shrike	Laniidae	<u>Lanius ludovicianus</u>	A		A	I	I	I
European Starling	Sturnidae	<u>Sturnus vulgaris</u>	A	I				
House Sparrow	Ploceidae	<u>Passer domesticus</u>	A	A		0	I	I
Western Meadowlark	Icteridae	<u>Sturnella neglecta</u>	A				I	I
Yellowheaded Blackbird	"	<u>Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus</u>						A
Bicolor Blackbird	"	<u>Agelaius phoeniceus cal.</u>	I	I	I	I	I	A
Bullock's Oriole	"	<u>Icterus bullockii</u>						I
Brewer's Blackbird	"	<u>Euphagus cyanocephalus</u>	I	I	I	I	I	I
Western Tanager	Thraupidae	<u>Piranga ludoviciana</u>					2	
Blue Grosbeak	Fringillidae	<u>Guiraca caerulea</u>						I
Evening Grosbeak	"	<u>Hesperiphona vespertina</u>						I
House Finch	"	<u>Carpodacus mexicanus</u>	I	I	I	I	I	I
Black Rosy Finch	"	<u>Leucosticte atrata</u>						(I)
Chipping Sparrow	"	<u>Spizella passerina</u>	A					
Harris' Sparrow	"	<u>Zonotrichia querula</u>						I
White-Crowned Sparrow	"	<u>Zonotrichia leucophrys</u>						(I)
Song Sparrow	"	<u>Melospiza melodia</u>	I	I	I	I	I	

.....  
56 species

	A	M	W	P	T	H
Confirmed-	29	31	14	22	16	25
Unconfirmed-	2	1	4		3	2

-----  
 I = Observed perching or feeding on the site  
 O = Observed flying over the site  
 A = Seen adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site  
 E = Evidence of presence, i.e. pellets, nest  
 2 = Remains found on site  
 () = Unconfirmed sighting

# AGROFORESTRY PROJECT

## Site Diversity

Site	# Invertebrates	# Mammals	# Birds	# Herps	# Plants
Allen	2.0	4	28-3	2	29
Murielotta	9.4	5	31-1	1	33
Wakefield	1.6	3	14-4	1	11
Peck	3.3	7	22	0	20
Thompson	2.4	2	16-3	1	22
Haynes	2.1	8	25-2	3	29

Table 1.1- A listing of the numbers of different species of each group of organisms found in or around the study sites.

## Site Similarity- Birds

Sites:	Allen	Murielotta	Wakefield	Peck	Thompson	Haynes
Allen	-----	70%	61%	74%	70%	74%
Murielotta	74%	-----	39%	42%	52%	48%
Wakefield	78%	67%	-----	61%	67%	56%
Peck	74%	56%	48%	-----	48%	52%
Thompson	60%	80%	60%	55%	-----	60%
Haynes	61%	54%	48%	43%	43%	-----

Table 1.2- Data taken from the bird species list and compared between sites. The higher the percentage, the greater the similarity in species composition.

## Site Similarity- Plants

Sites:	Allen	Murielotta	Wakefield	Peck	Thompson	Haynes
Allen	-----	55%	24%	38%	38%	48%
Murielotta	48%	-----	24%	42%	52%	48%
Wakefield	64%	73%	-----	36%	45%	55%
Peck	55%	70%	20%	-----	50%	55%
Thompson	44%	68%	20%	40%	-----	44%
Haynes	41%	47%	18%	32%	32%	-----

Table 1.3- Data taken from the plant species list and compared between sites. The higher the percentage, the greater the similarity in species composition.

# AGROFORESTRY PROJECT

## Capture Success

Site	Total Nights	%Captures	P.m.	M.c.	O.t.	P.m.	M.m.	P.c.
Allen	318	15.4	49	0	0	0	0	0
Murietta	219	24.7	48	0	0	1	4	1
Wakefield	319	3.4	11	0	0	0	0	0
Peck	310	16.3	40	11	0	0	0	0
Thompson	312	7.9	24	0	1	0	0	0
Haynes	315	4.1	0	0	0	4	9	0

Table 1.4- Summarizes trapping success for the period

## Total Captures

Site	7-20	7-22	7-27	7-29	8-3	8-7	T
Allen	8	12	13		9	7	49
Murietta	5*	7*	8		18	16	54
Wakefield	1	2	5	3	0		11
Peck	6	10	11	13	11		51
Thompson	4		7	7	3	4	25
Haynes	2		4	5	0	2	13
							<u>203</u>

Table 1.5- Summarizes the trapping success for the study period in absolute numbers for each site.

## Peromyscus Captures

Site	7-20	7-22	7-27	7-29	8-3	8-7	T
Allen	8	12	13		9	7	49
Murietta	4*	7*	6		16	15	48
Wakefield	1	2	5	3	0		11
Peck	5	9	8	10	8		40
Thompson	3		7	7	3	4	24
Haynes	0		0	0	0	0	0
							<u>172</u>

Table 1.6- Summarizes the trapping success for the most prevalent rodent found in the study sites. Notice that no Peromyscus were caught at Haynes during the period.

## Per Cent Traps Capturing Peromyscus

Site	7-20	7-22	7-27	7-29	8-3	8-7
Allen	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%
Murietta	80%	100%	75%		89%	94%
Wakefield	100%	100%	100%	100%	--	
Peck	83%	90%	73%	77%	73%	
Thompson	75%		100%	100%	100%	100%
Haynes	0%		0%	0%	--	0%

Table 1.7- Data taken from Table 1.6 and expressed in percentages. Note that for most sites few rodents other than Peromyscus were caught.

\*only one quarter of the traps were set out due to irrigation

# AGROFORESTY PROJECT

## PLANT LIST

Common Name	Family	Scientific Name	Location
Wild Oat	Poaceae	<i>Avena fatua</i>	A
Barnyard Grass	"	<i>Echinochloa crusgalli</i>	M F T H
Rabbitfoot Grass	"	<i>Polyodon monspeliensis</i>	F T
Littleseed Canarygrass	"	<i>Poa annua</i>	A T
Large Bermuda Grass	"	<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>	A H
Bearded Spangletop	"	<i>Leptochloa fascicularis</i>	M F T
Timothy Grass	"	<i>Phleum pratense</i>	M
Common Foxtail-Barley	"	<i>Horsebailagorinum/vulgare</i>	A
Alkali Rye	"	<i>Elymus tetradicoides</i>	H
Piggut Brome	"	<i>Bromus rigidus</i>	T
Red Brome	"	<i>Bromus rubens</i>	T H
Quackgrass	"	<i>Agropyron repens</i>	T
Johnson Grass	"	<i>Sorghum halepense</i>	H
Dallisgrass	"	<i>Paspalum dilatatum</i>	H
Saltgrass	"	<i>Distichlis spicata</i>	H
Sunflower	Asteraceae	<i>Helianthus annuus</i>	A M W F T H
Western Goldenrod	"	<i>Solidago occidentalis</i>	A M F
Common Groundsel	"	<i>Senecio vulgaris</i>	A M F T
Sowthistle	"	<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>	A M W F T H
Prickly Lettuce	"	<i>Lactuca scariola</i>	A M T H
Mare's Tail	"	<i>Conyza canadensis</i>	M F H
Cocklebur	"	<i>Xanthium canadense</i>	F
Russian Knapweed	"	<i>Centaurea repens</i>	T
Telegraph plant	"	<i>Heterotheca grandiflora</i>	M W H
Bull (or Milk) Thistle	"	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	F H
Common Spikeweed	"	<i>Hemizonia pogens</i>	H
Curly Dock	Polygonaceae	<i>Rumex crispus</i>	A M F H
Black Bindweed	"	<i>Polygonum convolvulus</i>	A
Common Knotweed	"	<i>Polygonum aviculare</i>	A M W T
Silversheath Knotweed	"	<i>Polygonum argyrocoleon</i>	
Swamp Smartweed	"	<i>Polygonum lapathifolium</i>	A
Jimson Weed	Solanaceae	<i>Datura meteloides</i>	A H
Chinese Thornapple	"	<i>Datura ferov</i>	M F
Deadly Nightshade	"	<i>Solanum nigrum</i>	A M T H
Ground Cherry	"	<i>Physalis angulata</i> var.	A M W
Hedge Mustard	Brassicaceae	<i>Sisymbrium officinale</i>	A
London Rocket	"	<i>Sisymbrium irio</i>	M T
Black Mustard	"	<i>Brassica nigra</i>	A
Nannie's Furse	"	<i>Capsella procumbens</i>	A M
Shepherd's Furse	"	<i>Capsella bursa-pastoris</i>	F
Burclover	Fabaceae	<i>Medicago hispida</i>	A
Alfalfa	"	<i>Medicago sativa</i>	A M F
Annual Yellow Sweetclover	"	<i>Melilotus indica</i>	A W P H
White Melilot	"	<i>Melilotus albus</i>	H

# AGRICULTURE PROJECT

## PLANT LIST

Wild Morning Glory Cressa	Convolvulaceae "	<u>Convolvulus arvensis</u> <u>Cressa trachelium</u>	A M F T H
Largeseed Dodder	Cuscutaceae	<u>Cuscuta indurata</u>	F H
Tumbling Figweed Prostrate Figweed Rough Figweed	Amaranthaceae " "	<u>Amaranthus blitoides</u> <u>Amaranthus albus</u> <u>Amaranthus retroflexus</u>	A M F T H A M F T H M T H
Common Furslane Red Maids	Portulacaceae "	<u>Portulaca oleracea</u> <u>Calandrinia ciliata</u>	M W T M W
Lambsquarters Saltbush Five-hook Bassia Alkali Elite Russian Thistle (Tumbleweed)"	Chenopodiaceae " " " "	<u>Chenopodium album</u> <u>Atriplex patula</u> var. <u>Bassia hyssopifolia</u> <u>Suaeda fruticosa</u> <u>Salsola iberica</u>	A M H M T H A M W F T H H M H
Cheeseweed Alkali Mallow	Malvaceae "	<u>Malva parviflora</u> <u>Sida leprosa</u>	T M H
Panicled Willow-herb	Onagraceae	<u>Epilobium paniculatum</u>	M
Red-stemmed Filaree	Geraniaceae	<u>Erodium cicutarium</u>	A W H
Yellow Nutgrass Hardstem Bulrush	Cyperaceae "	<u>Cyperus esculentus</u> <u>Scirpus acutus</u>	A H H
Puncture Vine Horse Furslane	Zygophyllaceae "	<u>Tribulus terrestris</u> <u>Trianthema portulacastrum</u>	T M
Corn Spurry Spurry	Caryophyllaceae "	<u>Spergula arvensis</u> <u>Spercularia bocconii</u>	M M T
Turkey Mullein	Euphorbiaceae	<u>Eremocarpus setigerus</u>	W
Seaside Heliotrope	Boraginaceae	<u>Heliotropium curassivicum</u>	H
Common Cattail	Typhaceae	<u>Ixpa latifolia</u>	H
			A M W F T H
65 species	21 families		29-33-11-20-25-34

# WALFORD FOREST RESEARCH PROJECT

## CLIP FISH POOLING

MURIEL- 25 samples = 0.25 sq. m.  
2 hectares = 20000 sq. m.

Species	Stems	%Total	Grams	%Total	G/S	Occ.	S/H	G/H
<i>C. arvensis</i>	5	100%	70	100%	6.4	8%	22222	142222

MURIELII- 25 samples = 0.24 sq. m.  
9.4 hectares = 94000 sq. m.

Species	Stems	%Total	Grams	%Total	G/S	Occ.	S/H	G/H
<i>A. patula</i>	6	11%	110	42%	18.8	5%	25641	432908
<i>C. arvensis</i>	10	19%	70	10%	3.0	15%	42705	136752
<i>C. oleraceus</i>	9	17%	16.5	6%	1.8	9%	38462	70513
<i>E. cruciellii</i>	21	39%	1	1%	<1	12%	89744	4274
<i>A. blitoides</i>	1	2%	<1	<1	<1	4%	4274	
<i>L. scariola</i>	3	6%	99	37%	33	6%	12821	423077
<i>C. arvensis</i>	4	7%	5	2%	1.25	4%	17094	21268
7 species	54	101%	266.5	99%			230771	1138690

WALFIELD- Section 1, 2 year old trees  
8 samples = .72 sq. m.  
exact acreage unknown

Species	Stems	%Total	Grams	%Total	G/S	Occ.
<i>A. albus</i>	35	78%	220	97%	6.4	37.5%
<i>A. blitoides</i>	8	18%	3.5	2%	<1	37.5%
<i>E. cicutarium</i>	1	2%	1	<1	1	12%
<i>E. oleracea</i>	1	2%	3.5	2%	3.5	12%
4 species	45	100%	227.5	101%		

Section 2, 3 year old trees  
13 samples = 1.17 sq. m.  
All samples empty

Section 3, 4 year old trees  
8 samples = .72 sq. m.  
All samples empty

-----  
Stems= total number of stems of particular species  
%Total= ratio of species stems to total number of stems for site  
Grams= total number of grams of particular species  
%Total= ratio of species grams to total number of grams for site  
G/S= grams per stem average  
Occ.= frequency of occurrence  
S/H= estimated stems for particular species per hectare  
G/H= estimated grams per particular species per hectare



# AGROFORESTRY PROJECT

## Clip Plot Analysis

FECH- 20 samples = 1.6 sq. m.  
3.3 hectares = 10000 sq. m.

Species	Stems	%Total	Grams	%Total	G/S	Occ.	S/H	G/H
C. canadensis	1032	95%	2027	95%	2	100%	5755555	11251111
C. arvensis	47	4%	88.5	4%	1.9	20%	251111	481667
H. grandiflora	1	<1%	2	<1%	2	5%	55556	11111
C. canadensis	1	<1%	2	<1%	2	5%	55556	122222
4 species	1081	99%	2109.5	100%	2	5%	6105556	11886111

THOMPSON- 25 samples = 2.25 sq. m.  
2.4 hectares = 24000 sq. m.  
All samples empty

HAYNES East- 10 samples = .9 sq. m.  
2.1 hectares = 21000 sq. m. - Total

Species	Stems	%Total	Grams	%Total	G/S	Occ.	S/H	G/H
D. spicata	217	68%	125.5	24%	<1	35%	2411111	1372222
H. curassavicum	5	2%	208	41%	41.6	10%	55556	2511111
L. scariola	3	1%	37.5	7%	12.5	15%	33333	416667
M. albus	29	9%	4.5	1%	<1	20%	322222	50000
C. album	11	3%	<1	<1	<1	15%	122222	
C. travillensis	16	5%	5	<1	<1	20%	177778	55556
C. canadensis	18	6%	44	9%	2.4	5%	200000	488889
H. pungens	5	2%	79	17%	15.8	10%	55556	877778
C. dactylon	11	3%	3.5	1%	<1	5%	122222	38889
Unknown	2	1%	<1	<1	<1	10%	22222	
10 species	317	100%	505	101%	<1	10%	3522222	5611112

HAYNES West- 10 samples = .9 sq. m.

Species	Stems	%Total	Grams	%Total	G/S	Occ.	S/H	G/H
E. hyssopifolia	19	8%	1124	62%	59.2	40%	211111	1248889
C. dactylon	19	8%	78.5	6%	4.1	30%	211111	872222
C. travillensis	75	31%	72	5%	1	50%	853333	800000
E. crusgalli	109	45%	2.5	<1%	<1	10%	1211111	27778
M. albus	6	2%	18	1%	3	20%	66667	200000
L. scariola	1	<1%	23	2%	23	10%	11111	255556
D. spicata	3	1%	2	<1%	<1	10%	33333	22222
H. pungens	1	<1	33	2%	33	10%	11111	366667
C. album	5	2%	2.5	<1%	<1	10%	55556	27778
H. curassavicum	2	1%	2	<1%	1	10%	22222	22222
Unknown	1	<1	1	<1	1	10%	11111	11111
11 species	241	98%	1363	99%	1	10%	2267777	2294445

# AGROFORESTRY PROJECT

## Line Intercept Analysis

ALLEN- 10 samples = 5000 cm  
Total cover = .84%

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
C. arvensis	42 cm	100%	100	42 cm	.84%

MURIELIA- Section 1  
10 samples = 5000 cm  
Total cover = 24.82%

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
A. patula	309 cm	25%	30%	103 cm	6%
L. scaricola	232 cm	19%	50%	46.4 cm	5%
H. annuus	195 cm	16%	20%	97.5 cm	4%
R. aviculare	143 cm	12%	30%	47.7 cm	3%
S. bocconii	121 cm	10%	40%	30.25 cm	2%
S. glaucaceus	114 cm	9%	90%	12.7 cm	2%
C. canadensis	54 cm	4%	30%	18 cm	1%
E. crusgalli	53 cm	4%	20%	26.5 cm	1%
F. angulata	12 cm	1%	20%	6 cm	<1%
R. crispus	6 cm	<1%	10%	6 cm	<1%
C. album	3 cm	<1%	10%	3 cm	<1%

11 species                      1241 cm                      100%                      24%

Section 2  
3 samples = 1500 cm  
Total cover = 59.53%

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
L. scaricola	390 cm	44%	100%	130 cm	26%
A. patula	158 cm	18%	100%	52.7 cm	11%
C. album	129 cm	14%	67%	64.5 cm	9%
H. annuus	112 cm	13%	67%	56 cm	7%
C. canadensis	75 cm	8%	100%	25 cm	5%
S. bocconii	31 cm	3%	33%	31 cm	2%

6 species                      893 cm                      100%                      60%

Dist.= total length of intercept by each species  
% Total= percentage of sum of intercept of all species  
Occ.= frequency of occurrence on intercept  
Ave. Size= average size of species intercept  
% Cover= percentage of intercept for each species for entire site

# AGROFORESTRY PROJECT

## Line Intercept Analysis

### MURIELITA-

#### Section 3

3 samples = 1500 cm

Total cover = 28%

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
<i>C. arvensis</i>	369 cm	86%	33%	369 cm	25%
<i>E. crusgalli</i>	38 cm	9%	33%	38 cm	3%
<i>P. monspeliensis</i>	6 cm	1%	33%	6 cm	<1%
<i>S. oleraceus</i>	7 cm	2%	67%	3.5 cm	<1%

4 species                      420 cm                      100%                      28%

#### Section 4

3 samples = 1500 cm

Total cover = 2.67 %

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
<i>S. bacconii</i>	38 cm	95%	67%	19 cm	3%
<i>S. oleraceus</i>	2 cm	5%	33%	2 cm	<1%

2 species                      40 cm                      100%                      3%

### WAKEFIELD- Section 1

3 samples = 1500 cm

Total cover = 67.27%

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
<i>A. albus</i>	830 cm	82%	100%	276.7 cm	55%
<i>A. blitoides</i>	77 cm	8%	67%	38.5 cm	5%
<i>H. grandiflora</i>	38 cm	4%	33%	38 cm	3%
<i>P. oleracea</i>	34 cm	3%	33%	34 cm	2%
<i>E. cicutarium</i>	23 cm	2%	33%	23 cm	2%
<i>S. oleraceus</i>	7 cm	1%	33%	7 cm	<1%

6 species                      1009 cm                      100%                      67%

#### Section 2

5 samples = 2500 cm

Total cover = 0%

#### Section 3

3 samples = 1500 cm

Total cover = 0%

### PECK-

12 samples = 6000 cm

Total cover = 115.12%

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
<i>C. canadensis</i>	5524 cm	80%	100%	460.3 cm	92%
<i>C. arvensis</i>	861 cm	12%	33%	215.25 cm	14%
<i>H. annuus</i>	365 cm	5%	17%	182.5 cm	6%
<i>H. grandiflora</i>	60 cm	1%	17%	30 cm	1%
<i>L. scariola</i>	53 cm	1%	42%	10.6 cm	1%
<i>E. hyssopifolia</i>	34 cm	<1%	8%	34 cm	<1%

6 species                      6907 cm                      99%                      114 %

## Line Intercept Analysis

THOMPSON- 10 samples = 5000 cm  
Total cover = 2.42%

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
A. albus	89 cm	74%	100%	89 cm	2%
S. vulgaris	25 cm	21%	100%	25 cm	<1%
T. tectestrus	7 cm	6%	100%	7 cm	<1%

3 species 121 cm 101% 2%

HAYNES East-  
5 samples = 2500 cm  
Total cover = 91.6%

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
D. spicata	701 cm	31%	80%	175.25 cm	28%
H. curassivicum	617 cm	27%	40%	308.5 cm	25%
H. pungens	561 cm	24%	40%	280.5 cm	22%
C. traxillensis	290 cm	13%	60%	96.7 cm	11%
C. canadensis	50 cm	2%	20%	50 cm	2%
C. album	38 cm	2%	20%	38 cm	2%
Unknown	28 cm	1%	20%	28 cm	1%
M. albus	4 cm	<1%	20%	4 cm	<1%
L. scariola	3 cm	<1%	20%	3 cm	<1%

9 species 2290 cm 100% 91%

HAYNES West-  
5 samples = 2500 cm  
Total cover = 136.32%

Species	Dist.	% Total	Occ.	Ave. Size	% Cover
E. hyssopifolia	783 cm	23%	60%	261 cm	31%
C. dactylon	675 cm	20%	60%	225 cm	27%
C. traxillensis	578 cm	17%	60%	192.7 cm	23%
E. crusgalli	465 cm	14%	40%	232.5 cm	19%
M. albus	275 cm	8%	20%	275 cm	11%
H. curassivicum	187 cm	5%	40%	93.5 cm	7%
H. pungens	180 cm	5%	40%	90 cm	7%
C. album	112 cm	3%	40%	56 cm	4%
L. scariola	102 cm	3%	40%	51 cm	4%
H. annuus	45 cm	1%	20%	45 cm	2%
H. grandiflora	6 cm	<1%	20%	6 cm	<1%

11 species 3408 cm 99% 137%

SECTION 8.0  
Salt/Water Balance Study



Agroforestry Demonstration Program -- Water and Salt Balance

Principal Investigator: Kenneth H. Solomon, Ph.D., P.E.,  
Director, Center for Irrigation Technology

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this project are to investigate: (1) the water and salt balance in the agroforestry system on a selected farm; and (2) the potential for reducing the volume of irrigation and drainage water and overall salt load in a farming system.

The objectives also include the installation of a drainage system and observation wells.

EXPECTED RESULTS

The water and salt balance in a farming system is affected by hydrological characteristics of the area, cropping systems, climatological conditions, water management practices on a given farm and in the surrounding area, and other factors. This type of project needs an operational period of several years to obtain results applicable to on-farm operations.

Under the assumption of project funding for 4 to 5 years, the following results are expected:

1. How effective trees and biofilter plants are in lowering the water table.
2. The input/output data on salts and water on a selected farm.
3. The evapotranspiration rates of trees and biofilter plants.
4. The salt absorption rates of trees and biofilter plants.
5. How effective trees and biofilter plants are in reducing the volume of irrigation water on a farm.
6. How effective trees and biofilter plants are in reducing the volume of drainage water on a farm.
7. How effective trees and biofilter plants are in reducing the salt load.
8. The development of farm management techniques to achieve optimum stability of salt and water conditions on a farm.

9. The effect of such techniques on crops, trees, and biofilter plants yield and quality.

METHOD

Project site:

Murietta farm, Fresno county

Data to monitor on the Murietta farm:

- \* Level of water tables (using observation wells)
- \* EC of water in observation wells
- \* Volume and EC of irrigation water applied to crops in the research area (RA)
- \* Volume and EC of drainage water outflow from RA
- \* Volume and EC of drainage/irrigation water applied to trees
- \* Volume and EC of drainage water outflow from the tree area
- \* Volume and EC of drainage/irrigation water applied to biofilter plants
- \* Volume and EC of drainage water outflow from the biofilter plant area
- \* Volume and EC of water delivered from the project to a drainage water disposal site
- \* Salt uptake by crops, trees, and biofilter plants
- \* Soil and water analysis from the areas of crops, trees, and biofilter plants
- \* Yields and production data on crops, trees, and biofilter plants
- \* Chemical composition of crops, trees, and biofilter plants
- \* Other data as needed for the study of water and salt balance

Technical and logistic support for the study:

1. Boundaries of the research area -- the fields surrounding the Agroforestry Demonstration Site, west from the San Luis drain at Jensen Road.
2. Location of the site for biofilter plants -- next to the Agroforestry Demonstration Site.
3. Location of a subsurface drain -- in the areas of the Agroforestry Demonstration Site and the biofilter plants.
4. Location of observation wells -- in a grid system, on the Agroforestry Demonstration Site and the biofilter plants.



5. Pumps and irrigation systems -- crops and trees - presently installed and used; biofilter plants - new installation required.
6. Disposal of drainage water from the biofilter plant site -- cooperation with the Westlands Water District required for the final disposal of this drainage water (selenium removal plant, deep well injection, or other method).

Frequency of data collection:

1. Related to on-farm operations (e.g., corresponding to the frequency of irrigation).
2. Two-week intervals (e.g., level of water tables, water EC in observation wells).
3. Semi-annually (e.g., soil, water, and plant tissue analysis).

COOPERATORS

The following agencies will cooperate in this project, and their responsibilities include:

Murietta Farms

Will provide land, crops, trees, and biofilter plants; farm management, irrigation, cultural practices; provide data about on-farm operations; installation of a subsurface drain (funded by the program) in cooperation with the USDA-SCS and other cooperators.

California Department of Food and Agriculture and U. S. Department of Agriculture-Soil Conservation Service

Overall program management; coordination of this water/salt balance study with other Agroforestry Demonstration Program projects, such as Tree Selection and Propagation, Wildlife Habitat, and Economics of Agroforestry; securing of funds for all phases of this project; interaction of agroforestry and water/salt management on farms.

University of California, Davis

Research design of the project; scientific evaluation of monitored data; preparation of progress and final reports.

California State University, Fresno

Data monitoring, analysis and reporting; installing of observation wells with the assistance of other cooperators.

SCHEDULE

	1987 ssfw	1988 ssfw	1989 ssfw	1990 ssfw	1991 ssfw
RESEARCH DESIGN	-xx-				
SITE DESIGN	-xx-				
SUBSURFACE DRAIN	-xx-				
OBSERVATION WELLS	-xx-				
PUMPS/IRRI EQUIP	-xx-				
DATA MONITORING	-xxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx
DATA ANALYSIS	---x	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx
PROGRESS REPORTS	---x	-x-x	-x-x	-x-x	-x--
FINAL REPORT			(x)		---x
WORKSHOPS			-x--	--x-	---x

Note: The present funding may be sufficient only until June 30, 1989. Additional funds are requested.

SECTION 9.0

Halophyte Biofilter Trial

Carolyn Watson  
Environmental Research Laboratory  
University of Arizona, Tuscon



## AGROFORESTRY AND HALOPHYTE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF DRAINAGE WATER DISPOSAL

### INTRODUCTION

Continuation of the agroforestry demonstration program on farms affected by drainage and salinity problems will further support this system as a method for management of San Joaquin's drainage water. This agroforestry system concept includes the reduction in drainage water volume and salt load and provision of tree by-products. Demonstration of this program is currently being conducted by cooperators headed by the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) and the U. S. Department of Agriculture-Soil Conservation Service (USDA-SCS).

The inclusion of halophytes as biofilter plants have been proposed to be an important component in the reduction of the salt/chemical load of drainage water. Field trial studies conducted in Mendota, California during 1986 have demonstrated the high productivities and regrowth abilities of Atriplex species, even when irrigated with saline water too high to support the growth of salt-tolerant trees. A summary of plant tissue chemical composition of various Atriplex species and other halophytes from these field trial studies is presented in Table 1. Results indicate that halophytes differ in their abilities to accumulate salt, Selenium and Boron. Average overall ash content of Atriplex species, which ranged from 17 to 36 percent, are relatively high when compared to conventional crops. Plant tissue Selenium levels of Atriplex barclayana, Atriplex lentiformis and Atriplex canescens were two to four times higher when irrigated with drainage water. The accumulation of Selenium in the plant tissue could provide a concentrated source of this element to be incorporated into a ruminant's feed ration. Crude protein content of clipped Atriplex plants averages around 15 percent and would also be a valuable component in a feed ration. Integration of the productivities, agronomic characteristics and chemical composition of various halophytes have resulted in a selection of candidates for further evaluation in the proposed agroforestry and halophyte demonstration program.

### Halophyte Research Area

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT

##### I. Site Location and Description

The halophyte research area will be south of the tree plantation site on Murrieta Farms in Mendota, California. Total area for the halophyte demonstration program will be five acres. Irrigation water to the trees will be with drainage water and/or a blend of drainage water. Irrigation water to the halophytes will be with the drainage water collected from the subsurface drains installed under the tree research area.

## II. Salt and Water Balance Research Activities

The agroforestry demonstration program, coordinated by the CFDA, USDA-SCS, California Department of Water Resources, University of California (Davis), California State University (Fresno) and California Agriculture Technology Institute will provide the following supplies, services and activities during the proposed 1987/1988 fiscal year.

1. Design and installation of subsurface drains, observation wells and in-line flow meters for the agroforestry and halophyte research areas.

2. Data monitoring of salt and volume of groundwater, irrigation water and drainage water through the agroforestry and halophyte research areas and evaluation of the water/salt balance study.

3. Analyses of soil and plant material at tree research site and of soil at Atriplex research site.

4. Measuring the evapotranspiration rates of trees and selected halophytes.

### PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Required funds to support the five acre halophyte research area in coordination with the agroforestry demonstration program are listed in the Budget. Responsibilities and activities of the cooperators are described below.

#### I. Murrieta Farms

1. Materials and installation of irrigation system in halophyte research area.

2. Weed, pest and disease control, planting and harvesting, irrigation, fertilization and other farm operations to implement appropriate cultural practices in the halophyte research area.

#### II. University of Arizona

1. Selection and provision of stem cuttings and seed stock for the halophyte research area.

2. Analyses and evaluation of harvested Atriplex material for salt and mineral uptake and forage quality.

3. Consultation on plant growth and development, planting dates, cultural practices, harvest times and method for the Atriplex and other halophyte crops.

### III. Cultural practices of the halophyte research area

During the 1986 field trials conducted on Murrieta farms, a total of 20 halophyte accessions from the Environmental Research Laboratory were evaluated for overall performance. Accessions

which demonstrated slow productivities, undesirable agronomic characteristics and slow regrowth were eliminated from the list of candidate plants. During the proposed 1988 halophyte field trials, a total of 10 Atriplex species and approximately 5 species of other halophytes will be evaluated for productivities, chemical composition and forage quality. Some of the most promising candidates of which seed is not currently available will be propagated by stem cuttings. The remaining species have a commercially available seed source and will be direct-seeded. Demonstration of direct-seeding for halophyte establishment will be important in the long-term economics of a halophyte plantation.

Atriplex will be direct-seeded between January 15 and February 15. A late winter planting date allows exposure of the seed to rainfall and low temperatures which enhances overall germination. All seed will be pretreated with fungicide before planting to control seedling damping-off. After stand is established, some hand-thinning may be necessary to achieve the desired spacing. Stem cuttings of selected Atriplex and other halophytes will be started during mid-December through mid-January for transplanting into the research area no later than March 15.

Plant spacing between and within rows will be between 2.0 and 2.5 feet. Each species will be seeded or transplanted into plot strips having widths to accomodate harvest equipment. An intensive weed control program is anticipated during the first year of shrub establishment.

It has been shown that shedding of leaves and flower parts in Atriplex may increase the salinity and sodicity of the soil surface. Multiple clippings to remove the top plant portions will promote the removal of salt from the irrigated land.

It is anticipated that some of the most productive Atriplex species will have two clipping harvests during the establishment year. The criteria for timing of harvest and clipping height will vary among the various accessions. Scheduling of harvest times and clipping height will be critical to the regrowth recovery of the clipped plants.

Multiple clippings will reduce the size and growth form and modify the shrubs structural features, thereby reducing attractiveness to game birds. This feature is considered to be ecologically important by discouraging Kesterson-type problems within the halophyte plantings.

Table 1. plant tissue analyses (dry weight basis) of halophytes grown at Site 1 (fresh water irrigated) and Site 2 (drainage water irrigated)

Species: Accession #	Site #	Clipped #	Ash -----g-----	Protein -----g-----	B --ppm--	Se
A. nummularia - 489	1	1	27.9	17.4		
A. nummularia - 489	1	2	25.8	13.3		
A. nummularia - 709	1	1	27.3	19.0		
A. nummularia - 709	1	2	23.7	18.6		
A. canescens - 606	1	1	19.5	14.6		
A. canescens - 606	1	2	14.9	12.9		
A. canescens - 824	2	1				1.34
A. canescens - 824	1	1	18.8	16.2		0.46
A. canescens - 824	1	2	16.5	14.7		
A. canescens - 824	1	1	39.5	22.0	43.9	1.04
A. barclayana	2	1	33.7	12.6	55.3	0.54
A. barclayana	1	1	33.2	11.1		
A. barclayana	1	2				
A. lentiformis- 710	2	1	22.5	17.2	12.8	0.91
A. lentiformis- 710	1	1	18.2	9.1	6.7	0.25
A. lentiformis- 710	1	2	21.3	11.3		
A. camarones - 203	2	1	28.9	13.3	6.3	0.63
A. bolusii - 488	2	1	36.0	16.1	28.7	0.52
A. deserticola- 288	2	1a	31.1	20.4		
A. deserticola- 288	2	1b	29.8	11.9	6.4	0.81
A. undulata - 163	2	1a	30.8	19.5		
A. undulata - 163	2	1b	34.5	12.5	30.0	
A. sp. - 873 "	2	1	26.6	18.7		
A. bunburyana - 463	2	1	25.8	18.6		
Salicornia	1	whole plant	33.1	10.1	132.0	
Suaeda sp.	1	whole plant	29.3	19.2	31.3	



**SECTION 10.0**  
**Financial Information**



STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD (SWRCB)  
Agreement # 7859

Agroforestry Program

AGFO CONTRACT  
SUBFILES: DELLABAL  
SJVFBAL  
CORNFBAL  
ZAPPEBAL  
FOOTEBAL  
OTHERBAL

DATE	SUBFILE LISTED IN	INVOICE, PAYMENT OR CHECK NUMBER	AMOUNT PAID OUT BY CDFA	AMOUNT SUBMITTED TO SWRCB	AMOUNT REIMBURSED BY SWRCB	10 % DEFERRED BALANCE	BALANCE OF CONTRACT	COMMENTS
							50,000	
2/28/86	SJVFBAL	152063	5,550					Deposit on 100,000 Eucalyptus
2/28/86	CORNFBAL	152063	750					Deposit on 5,000 Casuarina
2/28/86	ZAPPEBAL	152063	530					1,000 poplar seedlings
3/7/86	CORNFBAL I	4369	109					Seed procurement costs
?	SJVFBAL	?	5,580					Balance of previous order
?	CORNFBAL I	7465	2,070					Balance of previous order
2/9/87		pmt req #1		14,588				See payment request #1
2/25/87		08870304			13,128	1,460	35,412	See DBase No. 870304
7/25/86+?	OTHRBAL	5001-116	90					Farm Pump & Irrig. Co., PVC pipe & supplies
1/6/87	SJVFBAL	C07-057654	3,313					Down payment on agreement #8890
2/19/87	OTHRBAL	6002-116	(214)					The Bioengineering Corp., Selfin & Biotron ineligible for reimbursement
3/10/87?	OTHRBAL	6001-116	954					Planter from Miles Merwin
4/23/87+	FOOTEBAL I	8744	153					576 Eucalyptus seedlings
6/3/87		pmt req #2		4,723				See payment request #2
7/2/87	SJVFBAL	?	3,313					Final payment on agmt. 8890
8/17/87	DELLABAL	inv872974	2,970					5 soil @ \$290, 4 water @ \$380
9/23/87	DELLABAL	inv873582	75					Plant tissue:Se @ \$35, Feed analysis @ \$40
9/30/87		RC97970			2,982	331	32,099	Reimbursement for SJF invoice only (\$3313) balance due=4723-214(inelig.)-3313 = 1196

DELLAVALLE LABORATORY, INC.  
Agreement # 8891

DELLABAL  
SWRCB SUBCONTRACT

Agroforestry Program

DATE	DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	CHECK OR INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	BALANCE OF CONTRACT	COMMENTS
12/31/86						15,000	
7/27/87	5 soil samples 4 water samples	872974	2,970		2,970		soil @ \$290 ea. water @ 380 ea.
8/17/87	pmt on 872974			2970	0	12030	date sent to accts payable
9/21/87	Plant tissue/Se Feed Analysis	873582	75		75		Tissue @ \$35 Feed @ \$40
9/23/87	pmt on 873582			75	0	11,955	date sent to accts payable

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY FOLIAGE, INC.  
Seedling Purchases  
Agroforestry Program

SJVFBAL  
SWRCB NON-CONTRACTED EXPENSES

DATE	CHECK OR INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	TOTAL PAID	COMMENTS
1/31/86	DB 860203	5,000		5,000		Deposit for 100,000 E. camaldulensis @ \$0.105 each
2/28/86	C 152063		5,550	0	5,550	reimbursement to WRCD for deposit (1/2 of \$ 11,130 cost) Includes \$5,000 invoice
7/9/86	none	5,580		5,580		Balance of previous order
?	?		5,580	0	11,130	Payment of 7/9/86 invoice, See invoice for approval
2/9/87	Payment request #1 including \$11,130 submitted to SWRCB					
12/1/86	none	3,313		3,313		invoice for contract # 8890 30,000 Euc., Lake Albacutya 18,000 Euc., Mt. Bernstein @ \$0.125 each, total \$6625
1/6/87+	C07-057654		3,313	0	14,443	payment of contract invoice date of approval shown
6/3/87	Payment request #2 including \$3,312.50 submitted to SWRCB					
4/29/87?	none	3,313		3,313		2nd payment on agmt. 8890, same invoice as 1st pmt, date hand written in corner
7/2/87	?		3,313	0	17,755	payment on contract 8890

CORNFLOWER FARMS  
Seedling Purchases  
Agroforestry Program

CORNFBAL  
SWRCB NOW-CONTRACTED EXPENSES

DATE	CHECK OR INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	TOTAL PAID	COMMENTS
2/14/86	I 4369	109		109		Seed procurement costs C. glauca, C. cunninghamiana
?	I 9448	750		859		no date, deposit for 5,000 Casuarina @ \$0.30 each
2/28/86	C 152063		750	109	750	reimbursement to WRCD for deposit payment
3/7/86	? I 4369		109	0	859	date is when payment was approved for inv. 4369
7/9/86	I 7465	2,070		2,070		3137 C. cunninghamiana, 3131 C. glauca, 382 E. grandis @ \$0.40 each (containers & tax included)
?	I 7465		2,070	0	2,929	balance of invoice 7465 \$750 deposit already paid
2/9/87 Payment Request #1 including \$2,929 submitted to SWRCB						
4/16/87		160		160		400 Casuarina seedlings @ \$0.40 each

GEORGE ZAPPETTINI  
Seedling Purchases  
Agroforestry Program

ZAPPEBAL  
SWRCB NON-CONTRACTED EXPENSES

DATE	CHECK OR INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	TOTAL PAID	COMMENTS
2/6/86	I 4999	530		530		500 "Jaconotti" hybrid poplar 500 P. nigra-columnne, @ \$0.50 ea.
2/28/86	C 152063		530	0	530	payment for invoice 4999
2/9/87	Payment request #1 including \$530 submitted to SWRCB					

FOOTE'S EUCALUPTUS SEEDLINGS  
Seedling Purchases  
Agroforestry Program

FOOTEBAL  
SWRCB NON-CONTRACTED EXPENSES

DATE	CHECK OR INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	TOTAL PAID	COMMENTS
4/23/87	I 8744	153		153		576 Eucalyptus seedlings, Stratford Provenence @ \$0.25 each
?	I 8744		153	0	153	payment on invoice 8744
6/3/87	Payment request #2 including \$152.64 submitted to SWRCB					

## OTHER EXPENSES

## OTHERBAL

## SWRCB NON CONTRACTED EXPENSES

## Agroforestry Program

DATE	VENDER	INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	TOTAL PAID	COMMENTS
7/25/86	Farm Pump & Irrigation Co.	5001-116	90		90		30 - 1.5" X 10' PVC class 125 pipe 37 - 1.2" slip PVC caps 1 quart 717 PVC cement shop labor:set up & cut 10' lengths
?	Farm Pump & Irrigation Co.	5001-116		90	0	90	
2/11/87	Bioengineering Corp.	6002-116	214		214		12 Kg Selfin @ \$11.00/Kg 2 Kg Biotron @ \$35.00/Kg
2/19/87	Bioengineering Corp.	6002-116		214	0	304	
2/27/87	Miles & Eliz. Merwin	6001-116	954		954		tree planter with trailer
3/10/87?	Miles & Eliz. Merwin	6001-116		954	0	1,258	1,258 cancels agreement #7878 for lease of planter
6/3/87	Payment Request #2 including \$1,257.72 for other submitted to SWRCB						



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR-BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (USBOR)  
 CDFA Agreement # 9049  
 USBOR No. 7-FC-20-04900  
 Agroforestry Program

USBRBAL  
 AGFO CONTRACT  
 SUBFILES:SACHSBAL  
 LOHRBAL  
 CHESEBAL

DATE	PAYMENT LISTED IN SUBFILE	INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT PAID OUT BY CDFA	AMOUNT SUBMITTED TO USBR	AMOUNT REIMBURSED BY USBR	BALANCE OF CONTRACT	COMMENTS
						60,000	
5/ /87	LOHRBAL	3239825	629				April wages
5/12/87+	SACHSBAL	050750	9,431				First contract payment Date payment approved is shown
6/ /87	LOHRBAL	3560132	718				May wages
7/3/87	LOHRBAL	3872823	754				June wages
8/4/87	LOHRBAL	1178614	790				July wages
8/ /87				12,323			Invoices submitted for reimbursement
9/3/87	LOHRBAL	1477289	790				August wages
10/5/87	LOHRBAL	1775250	799				September wages
10/7/87	CHESEBAL	13032	8,000				First contract payment Date payment approved is shown
10/5/87					12,323	47,677	1st reimbursement

Total Paid 8/4/87                      21,912

UCD - ROY SACHS  
Agreement # 9016

SACHSBAL  
USBOR SUBCONTRACT

Agroforestry Program

DATE	DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	BALANCE OF CONTRACT	COMMENTS
3/1/87	contract					31,438	
4/29/87	contractor inv.	050750	9,431		9,341		
5/12/87+	approved pmt.	050750		9,431	0	22,007	Payment of invoice 050750

UCD - LU LOHR

LOHRBAL  
USBOR NON-CONTRACTED EXPENSE

Agroforestry Program

DATE	MONTH OF PAY PERIOD	HOURS WORKED	WARRANT NUMBER	GROSS AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT SUBMITTED TO USBOR	TOTAL PAID	COMMENTS
5/ /87	April	70	3239825	628.60		628.60	
6/ /87	May	80	3560132	718.40		1347.00	
7/3/87	June	84	3872823	754.32		2101.32	
8/4/87	July	88	1178614	790.24		2891.56	
8/20/87					2891.56		
9/3/87	August	88	1477289	790.24		3681.80	
10/5/87	September	89	1775250	799.22		4481.02	

CSUF - CHESEMORE  
Agreement # 9076

CHESEBAL  
USBOR SUBCONTRACT

Agroforestry Program

DATE	DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	CHECK OR INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	BALANCE OF CONTRACT	COMMENTS
6/4/87	contract					26,000	
7/1/87	1st payment	13032	8,000		8,000		1st pmt as per contract
10/7/87	1st payment	13032		8,000	0	18,000	date pmt approved is shown

## Agroforestry Program

10-11

UCD - TANJI  
Agreement # 9084

TANJIBAL  
CDFA SUBCONTRACT

Agroforestry Program

DATE	DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	CHECK OR INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	BALANCE OF CONTRACT	COMMENTS
6/25/87	contract					25,000	
8/10/87	1st payment	050918	5,000		5,000		pmt upon approval & signing of contract
10/7/87	1st payment	050918		5,000	0	20,000	date pmt approved is shown

CSUF - SOLOMON / WATER & SALT BALANCE  
Agreement # 9083

SOLOMBAL  
CDFA SUBCONTRACT

Agroforestry Program

DATE	DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	BALANCE OF CONTRACT	COMMENTS
6/25/87	contract					50,000	

CSUF - SOLOMON (CIT) / WATER MONITORING  
Agreement # 3516

CITBAL  
CDFA SUBCONTRACT

Agroforestry Program

DATE	DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	INVOICE NUMBER	AMOUNT BILLED TO CDFA	AMOUNT PAID BY CDFA	AMOUNT OUT- STANDING	BALANCE OF CONTRACT	COMMENTS
6/19/87	contract					4,900	

SECTION 11.0  
Agroforestry Directory



AGROFORESTRY MAILING LIST  
(3/18/88)

Dave Adams Department of Forestry P. O. Box 1590 Davis, California 95617	(916) 322-0126
Ron Adams P. O. Box 561 Davis, California 95617	(916) 753-2717
Gerald Ahlstrom Department of Forestry P. O. Box 944246 Sacramento, California 94244-2460	(916) 322-0174
A. D. Allen P. O. Box 696 Firebaugh, California 93622	(209) 659-3143
Eugene E. Andreuccetti State Conservationist Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 2121-C Second Street, Suite 102 Davis, California 95616-2852	(916) 449-2848
Virgil Backlund Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 2121-C Second Street Davis, California 95616	(916) 449-2819
Thor Bailey President Energy Production 2279 Nord Avenue Chico, California 95926	(916) 893-1368
David A. Bainbridge Dry Lands Research Institute University of California Riverside, California 92521	(714) 787-5797 787-3785
Dennis Beeson The Pacific Tree Company 904 East Brundage Lane Bakersfield, California 93307	(805) 322-7278

John Beyer Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 1130 O Street, Room 3302 Fresno, California 93721	(209) 487-5223
Ted Bloemhof 17851 Palm Avenue Shafter, California 93263	(805) 758-5105
W. (Bill) Brooks Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 2121 C - Second Street Davis, California 95616	(916) 449-2881
Richard G. Burau Director, Monterey Basin Pilot Monitoring Project Dept. of Land, Air and Water Resources Dept. of Environmental Toxicology University of California Davis, California 95616	(916) 752-0194 (916) 752-1491 (916) 752-1142
Jim Bushey Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 1716 North 11th Avenue, Suite B Hanford, California 93230	(209) 584-9209
Buttonwillow Land and Cattle Co. Attn: Larry Frey Route 1, Box 177 Buttonwillow, California 93206	(805) 764-5865
Sal Carollo 19212 19th Avenue Stratford, California 93266	(209) 924-9754
John Carter Wood Energy Program Department of Forestry P. O. Box 944246 Sacramento, California 94244-2460	(916) 322-0107
Vashek Cervinka Research Manager Agricultural Resources Branch Department of Food and Agriculture 1220 N Street, Room 104 Sacramento, California 94271-0001	(916) 445-6719



A. Dale Chapman Chapman Forestry Foundation P. O. Box 311 Davis, California 95616	(916) 756-3107
Dave Chesemore Department of Biology California State University Fresno, California 93740	(209) 294-2010 294-2001
Ed Craddock Office of Water Conservation Department of Water Resources 1416 Ninth Street Sacramento, California 95814	(916) 445-9958
Richard Daniel Environmental Services Branch Department of Fish and Game 1416 Ninth Street Sacramento, California 95814	(916) 445-1383
Nat B. Dellavalle Dellavalle Laboratory, Inc. 1910 W. McKinley, Suite 110 Fresno, California 93728	(209) 233-6129 Res. (209) 229-1797
Robert Delzell Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 2121 C - Second Street Davis, California 95616	(209) 449-2852
John Diener Round Rock Ranch P. O. Box 428 Five Points, California 93624	(209) 884-2234 (209) 884-2324
Don Duncan San Joaquin Experimental Range P. O. Box 91 O'Neals, California 93645	(209) 868-3349
Andy Dyer Department of Biology California State University Fresno, California 93740	(209) 266-0664
Pamela Elam-Wenzel Farm Advisor Urban and Environmental Horticulture University of California 1720 South Maple Avenue Fresno, California 93702	(209) 488-3285

Laora Fanger-Vexler Research Forester University of California 233 Mulford Hall Berkeley, California 94720	(415) 642-0279
Steve Fedje Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 1716 North 11th Avenue, Suite B Hanford, California 93230	(209) 584-9209
Peter F. Ffolliott Professor School of Renewable Natural Resources The University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona 85721	(602) 621-7276
Clarence Finch Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 1130 O Street, Room 2114 Fresno, California 93721	(209) 487-5125
Sherman Finch Forester RPF 190 Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 2121 C - Second Street Davis, California 95616	(916) 449-2852
Ann Fisher Cornflower Farms P. O. Box 896 Elk Grove, California 95624	(916) 689-1015
Ray Foote 544 E. Meadow Lane Lemoore, California 93245	(209) 924-2736
Louise Fortman Department of Forestry Mulford Hall University of California Berkeley, California 94720	(415) 642-7018
Terry Garvey Chief Engineer Westlands Water District 3130 North Fresno Street Fresno, California 93703	(209) 224-1523

Don Gasser Department of Forestry University of California Berkeley, California 94720	(415) 642-5059
Randall Godden Cooperative Watershed Program Forest Service U. S. D. A. 2121 C - Second Street, Suite 102 Davis, California 95616	(916) 551-1715
Clarence Gowens P. O. Box 215 Five Points, California 93624	(209) 884-2248
Stephen Grattan Land, Air and Water Resources University of California Davis, California 95616	(916) 752-1103 752-0453
O. P. Gulati Senior Water Resources Control Engineer Division of Water Rights State Water Resources Control Board 901 P Street Sacramento, California 95814	(916) 324-5630
George Hanna School of Engineering 122 East Engineering Building Fresno, California 93740-0094	(209) 294-2500
Blaine Hanson Land, Air and Water Resources University of California Davis, California 95616	(916) 752-1130 752-0453
Gene Hartzell Nurseries and Tree Improvement Department of Forestry P. O. Box 1590 Davis, California 95617	(916) 322-2299
Haynes and Sons Attn: James C. Haynes/James C. Haynes, Jr. 1335 Lassen Drive Hanford, California 93230	(209) 582-5449
Cosmo C. Insalaco Agricultural Commissioner 1730 South Maple Avenue Fresno, California 93702	(209) 488-3510

International Council for  
Research in Agroforestry  
P. O. Box 30677  
Nairobi  
KENYA, East Africa

Farouk T. Ismail (916) 322-3408  
Chief, Technical Support 322-3600  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Division of Clean Water Grants  
901 P Street  
Sacramento, California 95814

Wesley Jarrell (714) 787-3785  
Department of Soil and Environmental Sciences  
University of California  
2217 Geology Building  
Riverside, California 92521

Bryan Jenkins (916) 752-1422  
Agricultural Engineering Department  
University of California  
Davis, California 95616

Dan Johnson (209) 487-5125  
Soil Conservation Service  
U. S. D. A.  
1130 O Street  
Fresno, California 93721

Greg Jorgensen (209) 294-2066  
Center for Irrigation Technology  
California State University  
Fresno, California 93740

Amram (Ron) Kadish (805) 482-5827  
1980 Hobart Drive  
Camarillo, California 93010

Martin M. Karpiscak (602) 621-1955  
Research Scientist  
Office of Arid Lands Studies  
845 N. Park Avenue  
The University of Arizona  
Tucson, Arizona 85719

Herschel Kimble (805) 861-4129  
District Conservationist  
Soil Conservation Service  
U. S. D. A.  
5500 Ming Avenue, Suite 165  
Bakersfield, California 93309

Kings Outreach Boys Ranch Attn: Wesley Champlin 13787 Kansas Avenue Hanford, California 93230	(209) 584-0181
Mike Kobzeff San Joaquin Foliage, Inc. 6171 W. Olive Avenue Fresno, California 93711	(209) 275-3608
Tom Ledig Institute of Forest Genetics P. O. Box 245 Berkeley, California 94701	(415) 486-3134
Ed Lee U. S. Bureau of Reclamation 280 Cottage Way, MP-190 (Room W-2143) Sacramento, California 95825	(916) 978-4969
Luanne Lohr Department of Agricultural Economics University of California Davis, California 95616	(916) 752-6457
John B. Loomis Division of Environmental Studies University of California Davis, California 95616	(916) 752-0523
Phil Lopez Soil Conservationist Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 5500 Ming Avenue, Suite 165 Bakersfield, California 93309	(805) 861-4129
Cecil V. Martin Chief, Environmental Services Section State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality 901 P Street Sacramento, California 95814	(916) 322-6598
Jeanne Martin Department of Forestry P. O. Box 1590 Davis, California 95617	(916) 322-2299
Frank Menezes Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 1716 North 11th Avenue, #B Hanford, California 93230	(209) 584-9209

Miles Merwin International Tree Crops Institute P. O. Box 888 Winters, California 95694	(916) 795-2440
George Miller, Jr. 7447 Pitt School Road Dixon, California 95620	(916) 678-2496
Steve Moore U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program MP-190, Room W-2143 2800 Cottage Way Sacramento, California 95825	(916) 978-4969
Murrieta Farms Attn: David Woolley 5854 S. San Diego Avenue Mendota, California 93640	(209) 655-3221
Jim Nee U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program MP-190, Room W-2143 2800 Cottage Way Sacramento, California 95825	(916) 978-4969
Dan Nelson San Luis Water District P. O. Box 2135 Los Banos, California 93635	(209) 826-4043
Bob Norona Tri-Valley Growers P. O. Box 3327 Modesto, California 95353	(209) 526-4100 ext 2270
Ralph Osterling 1650 Borel Way, Suite 204 San Mateo, California 94402	(415) 573-8733
Robert Peyton Special Projects Agriculture and Natural Resources 2120 University Avenue, 7th Floor Berkeley, California 94720	(415) 644-4235
Claude J. Phene Agricultural Research Service 2021 S. Peach Avenue Fresno, California 93727	(209) 251-0437

Pete Price Principal Consultant Assembly Office of Research 1100 J Street, Fifth Floor Sacramento, California 95814	(916) 445-1638
Larry K. Puckett California Department of Fish and Game San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program MP-190, Room W-2143 2800 Cottage Way Sacramento, California 95825	(916) 978-4981
Raul Ramirez Soil Conservationist Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 5500 Ming Avenue, Suite 165 Bakersfield, California 93309	(805) 861-4129
Ilona Rice Research Assistant Agricultural Resources Branch Department of Food and Agriculture 1220 N Street, Room 104 Sacramento, California 94271-0001	(916) 322-6832
Romeo A. "Rome" Rivera, P.E. Leader, River Basin Planning Staff Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 2121-C Second Street Davis, California 95616	(916) 449-2861
Gary Rose Tulare Lake Drainage District P. O. Box 985 Corcoran, California 93212	(209) 992-3145
Roy Sachs Department of Environmental Horticulture University of California Davis, California 95616	(916) 752-3071
Ronald Schultz Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 2828 Chiles Road Davis, California 95616	(916) 449-2852
Jon Shaver, Director California Agricultural Technology Institute California State University Fresno, California 93740	(209) 294-2361

Bob Slayback Soil Conservation Service U. S. D. A. 2828 Chiles Road Davis, California 95616	(916) 449-2852
Felix Smith Habitat Resources U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2800 Cottage Way Sacramento, California 95825	(916) 978-4877
Ken Solomon Director Center for Irrigation Technology California State University Fresno, California 93740	(209) 294-2066
Rich Standiford U. C. C. E. Forestry University of California Mulford Hall Berkeley, California 94720	(415) 642-2360
Don Swain Bureau of Reclamation San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program MP-190, Room W-2143 2800 Cottage Way Sacramento, California 95825	(916) 978-4969
Ken Tanji Land, Air and Water Resources University of California Davis, California 95616	(916) 752-0683 752-0453
Maurice H. Taylor U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2800 Cottage Way Sacramento, California 95825	(916) 978-4613
Ben Thompson Nor-Cal Resources, Inc. 951 Live Oak Boulevard Yuba City, California 95991	(916) 674-2908
Thomsen Brothers Attn: Tom Thomsen P. O. Box 258 Cantua Creek, California 93608	(209) 829-6469



Timothy Tidwell Plant Pathologist Analysis and Identification Department of Food and Agriculture 1220 N Street, Room 340 Sacramento, California 94271-0001	(916) 445-4521
James R. Tischer President The Tischer Group 1551 East Shaw Avenue, Suite 120 Fresno, California 93710	(209) 221-1388
Bill Verdegaal 13821 Lacey Boulevard Hanford, California 93230	(209) 582-9205
David Wakefield 33578 West Dinuba Cantua Creek, California 93608	(209) 698-5186
Carol Watson Environmental Research Lab 2601 East Airport Drive Tucson, Arizona 85706-6985	(602) 621-7962
Way Farms Rich Wegis Richard Young Route 1, Box 161 Buttonwillow, California 93206	(805) 764-5264
Dennis Westcot Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board 3443 Routier Road Sacramento, California 95827-3098	(916) 361-5688
Tolbert Williams 317 Sundan Avenue Buttonwillow, California 93206	(805) 764-5543
Roy Woodward Sequoia Research Laboratory P. O. Box 1802 Davis, California 95616	(916) 758-2832
David Woolley Murrieta Farms 5854 South San Diego Avenue Mendota, California 93640	(209) 655-3221

Lin Wu  
Associate Professor  
Department of Environmental Horticulture  
University of California  
Davis, California 95616

(916) 752-7179

Mr. George Zappettini  
17844 Yosemite Road  
Sonora, California 95370

(209) 928-3468

## **SECTION 12.0**

### **Glossary**



## 12.0 Glossary

**AGROFORESTRY:** A concept which uses tree plantings to support the production of farm crops through improved water management and reduced soil erosion. The trees also increase the production and marketing options for farmers.

**BIOFILTER:** Plants which accumulate selenium and salts and which may be grown for the purpose of partial removal of these elements from a farming system.

**BIOMASS:** Crops and trees grown and harvested as industrial or energy commodities.

**COPPICE:** The regrowth of trees from stumps after cutting.

**CUTTINGS:** Portion of a stem, root, or leaf cut from the parent plant for the production of a new independent plant by inducing it to form shoots and roots under favorable environmental conditions.

**DEFOLIANTS:** Agricultural chemicals applied for removing foliage from plants (e.g., defoliants applied before cotton harvesting).

**DESALINIZATION PLANT:** A water treatment facility which uses industrial technology for removing salts from water.

**ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY (EC):** One way of measuring salinity of water or soils, commonly expressed as millimhos per centimeter (mmhos/cm) or deciSiemens per meter (dS/m), equivalent terms. EC can also be related to osmotic pressure, which influences the amount of water a plant's roots can extract from the soil. One mmhos/cm or dS/m corresponds to about 640 parts per million total dissolved solids (see ppm, TDS).

**EVAPOTRANSPIRATION (ET):** The quantity of water transpired and evaporated from plant tissues and the surrounding soil surface. Quantitatively, it is expressed in terms of volume of water per unit area over a specified period of time (i.e., acre-feet per acre per year) or depth of water during a specified period of time (i.e., meters per year).

**GYPSUM:** Calcium containing soil amendment applied to soils with a high concentration of sodium. The calcium replaces sodium on soil particles so that the sodium may be leached below the root zone.

**HALOPHYTE:** A plant with high salinity tolerance which may uptake salts and can be irrigated with highly saline water.

**LEACHING:** The application of sufficient amounts of excess water to a field in order to flush out salts.

LEACHING REQUIREMENT: The amount of water required to flush a sufficient quantity of salts from the root zone to maintain full crop productivity.

PARTS PER MILLION (ppm): Equal to one part of a substance dissolved in one million parts of a solution. Nearly equivalent to milligrams per liter.

PERCHED WATER TABLE: Ground water supported by a zone of material of low permeability and situated above an underlying main body of ground water with which it is not hydrostatically connected.

PERCOLATION: Movement of water down through the soil toward the water table (the level at which water stands in a well).

SALINE SINK: A body of water or soil too salty for crop production.

SALINE SOIL: A soil high in soluble salts but without too much exchangeable sodium.

SALINE-SODIC SOIL: A soil which has both high soluble salt and sodium levels.

SALT BALANCE: Equilibrium achieved when the amount of salt entering an area (through irrigation) equals the amount of salt leaving (through leaching the root zone)

SEEDLING: Young plant originating from seed.

SEED SOURCE: A plant or geographical location from which seeds are obtained.

SEEPAGE: The gradual movement of water through the soil; usually refers to canal or ditch banks.

SELENIUM: Non-metallic trace element which is a necessary nutrient in very small amounts but can be toxic in high doses.

SODIC SOIL: A soil high in sodium but low in soluble salts.

SODIUM ABSORPTION RATIO (SAR): Ratio which indicates the relative activity of sodium ions as they react with clay. It can be determined by using the following equation:

$$\text{SAR} = \frac{\text{Na}}{\frac{\sqrt{\text{Ca} + \text{Mg}}}{2}}$$

SOIL AMENDMENT: A substance mixed into the soil to improve its properties. Usually applied to materials used to improve physical conditions.

SUBSURFACE DRAINAGE WATER: Water from perched water tables which has been removed by underground "tiles" or drainage systems.

TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS (TDS): Measure of salts dissolved in water.

VALUE-ADDED PRODUCTS: Commodities processed from raw farm products which have a higher market value.





## Credits

Many people contributed to the San Joaquin Valley Agroforestry Demonstration Program and to the development of this report. The major contributors are identified below.

Program Administration/ Data Coordination & Analysis	Vashek Cervinka Ilona Rice	CDFA CDFA
Field Trial Management	Clarence Finch John Beyer Frank Merezes Raul Ramirez	USDA-SCS USDA-SCS USDA-SCS USDA-SCS
Tree Selection and Propagation Project	Roy Woodward Roy Sachs Miles Merwin	UC Davis UC Davis ITCI
Economic and Marketing Study	Luanne Lohr	UC Davis
Wildlife Study	Andrew Dyer David Chesemore	CSU Fresno CSU Fresno
Halophyte Biofilter Trial	Carol Watson	UA Tuscon

\*

\*

\*







P00001898